THE PAPERS *of the*
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

VOLUME FIFTY-FOUR THIRD QUARTER, 1960

A Textual Paradox: Rochester's "To a Lady in a Letter"

By DAVID M. VIETH

I

THE text of the song by John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, usually known as "To a Lady in a Letter" is significant for several reasons. To the general reader, this poem is interesting as one of Rochester's cleverest lyrics and one of the finest songs of the late seventeenth century. For Rochester's editors and biographers, it provides the best example yet discovered showing his methods of revising his poetry—indeed it proves, contrary to the still-prevalent popular notion, that he *did* revise his work. To the textual critic with no special concern for Rochester, it offers an intriguing puzzle which is classic in its clarity and capable of almost complete solution.

If the *textus receptus* of a literary work should be the last complete draft from its author's hands, then the textual traditions of "To a Lady in a Letter" are a bundle of paradoxes. The early texts of the poem readily divide into three groups, which in this discussion will be termed "versions" and designated A, B, and C. At first glance, version B might seem the logical candidate for *textus receptus* because it is preserved in a draft in Rochester's own handwriting. Actually, it is an intermediate state in process of revision and therefore less satisfactory than either version A or version C, both of which probably represent final drafts even though neither is known to exist in a holograph manu-

script. Version A might also seem a likely choice, since it was printed in 1680 in the first collected edition of Rochester's works, a volume that provides the best extant texts for many of his poems and served as an ultimate source for almost all later Rochester editions. This version, however, was apparently the earliest of the three to be written and is therefore least representative of Rochester's final intentions.

Version C, the version an editor should adopt, presents further paradoxes. Jacob Tonson's edition of 1691, which frequently derives its texts from those of 1680, nevertheless uses some manuscript source for this poem and prints version C. Unlike the earliest texts of versions A and B, however, Tonson's text is seriously bowdlerized—or "castrated," as Rochester's contemporaries would have said. Though version C was evidently the last to be written, it was the first to be published, appearing in a miscellany dated 1676. But even this text is bowdlerized, albeit less thoroughly than in Tonson's edition.

The paradoxes of the seventeenth-century textual history of the poem have continued to haunt its treatment by Rochester's numerous twentieth-century editors, none of whom has examined the problem exhaustively or distinguished the three versions one from another. Although most editors—including John Hayward, Quilter Johns, Harry Levin, Ronald Duncan, and Vivian de Sola Pinto—have rightly selected version C, they have reprinted Tonson's text, which is the most fully bowdlerized, and some have used later Tonson editions instead of the first edition of 1691. Hayward also classified version A (which he printed in a deteriorated text) as spurious and termed version C "the original version"—conclusions, I suggest, quite opposite to the real situation. Though Pinto chose version C for his edition, in his earlier biography of Rochester he printed the uncompleted holograph text of version B as if it were a final draft. James Thorpe was the first editor to perceive that Tonson's text is bowdlerized, but his resulting generalization that the edition of 1680, which gives version A, "presents the most reliable text of the core of the Rochester canon" is too sweeping and does not, in particular, apply to this poem.[1]

[1] John Hayward, *Collected Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester* (1926), pp. 15, 313, 351. Quilter Johns, *The Poetical Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester* (1933), p. 25. Harry Levin, *A Satire against Mankind and Other Poems by John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester* (1942), p. 14. Ronald Duncan, *Selected Lyrics and Satires of John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of Rochester* (1948), p. 51; *Rochester* (1959), p. 20. Vivian de Sola Pinto, *Rochester:*

Among the early printed texts of "To a Lady in a Letter," the only one not favored by Rochester's editors is that of 1676, which the evidence shows to be closer than any other to his final intentions. Moreover, the finest text of all, extant in a manuscript, is the only known text of any importance that has never before appeared in print.

II

Investigation of the early texts of "To a Lady in a Letter" must begin with a separate examination of each of the three versions.

Version A, consisting of six four-line stanzas, exists in two independently derived texts that are verbally identical. Text A1 occurs (p. 146) in a large manuscript miscellany, compiled in spring or summer of 1680, which is located in the Yale University Library and has been designated the Yale MS. Text A2 was printed in Rochester's *Poems on Several Occasions*, 1680, the first collected edition of his works. The verbal congruence of texts A1 and A2 is not surprising, for the Yale MS. and the edition of 1680 bear a close collateral relationship to each other, both being descended independently from a no longer extant manuscript archetype; evidence in support of this conclusion has been presented in detail elsewhere.[2] Text A1 is here reproduced; A2 is easily accessible in Thorpe's volume (p. 68).

Song.

How happy Cloris (were they free)
Might our Enjoyments prove,
But you wth formall Jealousie
Are still tormenting Love.

Portrait of a Restoration Poet (1935), p. 40; *Poems by John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester* (1953), p. 22. James Thorpe, *Rochester's Poems on Several Occasions* (1950), pp. [v], xxxvi.

[2] In my article, "The Text of Rochester and the Editions of 1680," *PBSA* L (1956), 243-63. See Thorpe for full bibliographical information on the first and later editions of 1680. Text A1, which has no known descendants, is reproduced with the kind permission of the officials of the Yale University Library. Text A2 was reprinted in the other editions of 1680 and in later editions in the same series published in 1685, 1701, 1713, and 1731. From the the edition of 1685 it was reprinted in *The Triumph of Wit*, 1688 and 1692. From some edition of this miscellany it was again reprinted in the second volume of *The Hive*, 1724.

Let us (since Witt instructs us how)
Raise pleasure to y^e^ topp,
If Rivall Bottle you'll allow,
I'll suffer Rivall Fopp.

There's not a briske insipid Sparke,
That flutters in y^e^ Town,
But w^th^ your wanton Eyes you marke,
The Coxcomb for your owne.

You never thinke it worth your care,
How empty nor how dull,
The heads of your Admirers are,
Soe that their Codds be full.

All this you freely may confesse,
Yet we'll not disagree;
For did you love your pleasure lesse,
You were not fit for me

While I, my Passion to pursue
Am whole Nights takeing in
The lusty Juice of Grapes, take you
The lusty Juice of Men.

Version B, consisting of eight stanzas, is found in two manuscript texts, the first in Rochester's handwriting and the second derived from the first. Text B1 is preserved at the University of Nottingham in a collection known as the Portland MS. (fol. 1^r^), where it appears together with eight other poems and a short prose piece in Rochester's autograph; this manuscript also includes seven poems in the hand of Rochester's wife and one poem in a hand not yet identified. Text B2 occurs in British Museum Harleian MS. 7316 (fol. 21^v^) as one of six poetical texts which almost certainly descend from the Portland MS. and are probably direct copies. The derivation of these six poems is indicated by evidence too extensive to consider here.[3]

In the holograph text B1, the last two stanzas are preceded by a symbol consisting of a long horizontal line twice looped back on itself. Between the second and third stanzas is another symbol probably

[3] This evidence will be analyzed in a book on Rochester which was completed during 1959-60 with the assistance of a grant from the American Philosophical Society.

formed in similar fashion but looking like a long horizontal line with a dot at its center surrounded by a small circle. The last two stanzas are plainly out of place in their present position, as the scribe of B2 recognized by leaving a wide space to separate them from the rest of the poem. Evidently Rochester intended to insert the last two stanzas between the second and third; this conclusion is supported by additional circumstances to be discussed shortly.

Since text B2 provides no information not available in its source, only B1 need be reproduced.[4] In two instances where B1 has readings deleted and then rewritten in altered form above the line, B2 adopts the revised reading. In line 19, B2 repairs Rochester's inadvertent omission of the last letter of "your," but in line 10 it does not correct his similar omission of the last letter of "flutters." In all other readings B2 is verbally identical with B1.

[no title]

perfect
How happy Cloris, & how free
Would these enjoyments prouve,
But you wth formall jealousy
Are still tormenting Love

[5] Lett us (since witt instructs us how)
Raise pleasure to the topp,
If Rivall bottle you'l allow
I'le suffer rivall fopp,

[symbol]

Ther's not a brisk insipid sparke
[10] That flutter in the Towne
But wth y^{r} wanton eyes you marke
Him out to be y^{r} owne

[4] In reproducing B1, I have normalized Rochester's erratic indention of lines. Besides the symbols separating stanzas 2 and 3 and stanzas 6 and 7, B1 includes a short horizontal line between stanzas 1 and 2, 3 and 4, 5 and 6, and 7 and 8. Stanzas 4 and 5 are not separated by one of these lines because stanza 4 occurs at the bottom of a page. B1 has no known descendants except B2. B1 has twice been printed by Pinto, once in his biography (p. 40) and again in his edition (p. 167). Both of Pinto's texts omit the symbols after the second and sixth stanzas, give the first two words of line 13 wrongly as "Nor ever" instead of "You never," and reproduce accidentals rather carelessly. In his edition (pp. 166-67), Pinto mistakenly groups the text in Harvard MS. Eng. 636F with those representing version A and describes it as "not so full" as B1.

You never thinke it worth y^r^ care
How empty nor how dull
[15] The heads of y^r^ admirers are
Soe that their backs / purse bee full.

All this you freely may confess
Yett wee'l not disagree
For did you love you pleasures less
[20] You were not fitt for mee

Whilst I my passion to persue
Am whole nights taking in
Lusty juice of
The juice of Lusty grapes, take you
The juice of Lusty Men—

[symbol]

[25] Upraide mee not that I designe
Tricks to delude y^r^ charmes
When running after mirth & wine
I leave y^r^ Longing Armes

For wine (whose power alone can raise
[30] Our thoughts soe farr above)
Affords Idea's fitt to praise
What wee thinke fitt to Love

Version C, in eight stanzas, exists in four texts, each deriving at least one reading from sources not known to be extant. Text C1, here reproduced as base copy, appears in Harvard MS. Eng. 636F (p. 8), a large manuscript miscellany assembled during the early 1680's which is familiar to Restoration scholars. Text C2 was printed in *A New Collection of the Choicest Songs,* 1676 (sig. A4^r^), and text C3 in *The Last and Best Edition of New Songs,* 1677 (sig. D3^r^). Text C4 is found in Rochester's *Poems, &c. on Several Occasions,* 1691 (p. 36), published by Tonson. In the apparatus following the base copy, variants in spelling, capitalization, and punctuation are ignored.[5]

[5] I am grateful to the officials of the Houghton Library of Harvard University for permission to print text C1; its sometimes erratic indention of lines has been normalized. C1 has no known descendants, and C2 has none except C3. C4 was reprinted in the later Tonson editions of 1696, 1705, 1714, and 1732, and in piracies dated 1710 and 1718.

To A Lady, in A Letter.

1

Such perfect Blisse faire Chloris, wee
In our Enjoyment prove
'Tis pitty restless Jealiousy
Should Mingle with our Love.

2

Lett us (since witt has taught us how)
Raise pleasure to the Topp
You Rivall Bottle must allow
I'le suffer Rivall Fopp.

3

Thinke not in this, that I designe
A Treason 'gainst Loves Charmes
When following y^e^ God of Wine
I Leave my Chloris armes.

4

Since you have that for all your hast
Att which I'le ne're repine
Will take his Likour of as fast
As I can take of mine.

5

There's not A brisk insipid Sparke
That Flutters in y^e^ Towne
But with your wanton eyes, you marke
Him out to be your owne.

6

Nor doe you thinke it worth your care
How empty and how dull
The heads of yo^r^ Admirers are
Soe that their Codds be full.

7

All this you freely may Confesse
Yett wee nere disagree
For did you love your pleasure lesse
You were noe Match for mee.

8

Whilst I my pleasure to pursue
[30] Whole nights am takeing in,
The Lusty Juice of Grapes, take you
The Juice of Lusty Men:

Heading] Against jealousie. *C2, C3*
Stanza numbers om. C2, C3
2 Enjoyment] enjoyments *C2, C3*
8 I'le] I *C2, C3*
10 A Treason 'gainst] treason against *C2, C3*
15 Will take his Likour of] Will take its ------- off *C2*; Will take its liquor off *C3*; Its Pleasure can repeat *C4*
16 can take of mine] do take off mine *C2, C3*; the Joys of Wine *C4*
24 Codds] bags *C2, C3*; Veins *C4*
26 wee] we'd *C2, C3*
28 Match] mate *C2, C3*
28 mee.] me, &c. *C2, C3*
29-32 *om. C2, C3, C4*

Texts C2, C3, and C4 are rather obviously bowdlerized. C2 and C3 omit the last stanza but include after line 28 the sign "&c.," implying that another stanza originally followed. In line 24, the vague and ambiguous "bags" of C2 and C3 seems to replace an obscene word, probably "Codds" as in C1. In line 15, C2 omits an objectionable word, probably "liquor" as in C3 and C1. It is not unusual to find the process of castration carried even further in C4 than in C2 and C3, since the edition of 1691 normally bowdlerizes all obscene or blasphemous poems by alteration or omission. C4 omits the last stanza, replaces the obscene word in line 24 with "Veins," and verbally alters lines 15 and 16 even while retaining more or less their original sense. Though C2, C3, and C4 agree in omitting the last stanza, the bowdlerization of C4 is probably independent of that in C2 and C3; there is no evidence that the edition of 1691 was influenced in other instances by the miscellanies of 1676 and 1677.

Texts C2 and C3 are reducible to a hyperarchetype C2-C3. Indeed, except for the single word "liquor" in line 15, C3 is a verbally identical reprint of C2. The miscellanies of 1676 and 1677 were both published by Philip Brooksby, and they appeared within a few months of each

other: *A New Collection* was licensed on 28 Apr. 1676 and advertised in the *Term Catalogues* on 12 June, while *The Last and Best Edition* was licensed on 20 Nov. 1676 and advertised in the *Term Catalogues* on 22 Nov. Aside from the word "liquor," C3 slavishly follows C2 even in accidentals; the only deviations are the insertion of one comma, capitalization of the initial letter in four words, and a single-letter spelling change. Since the word "liquor" appears in C1 as well as C3, it was almost certainly the reading of the manuscript copy-text of C2. After the publication of C2, Brooksby doubtless decided that "liquor" was not too offensive and restored it from his manuscript when C3 was printed. Clearly, the hyperarchetype C2-C3 is this manuscript, whose readings we must reconstruct as best we can from its two direct descendants and the other two texts of version C. C2-C3 will therefore consist of the text of C2 with "liquor" inserted in line 15, and—lacking evidence to contradict—with "Codds" substituted for "bags" in line 24 and an eighth stanza identical with that in C1. These last two decisions are further supported by the appearance of "Codds" in version A and the inclusion of an equivalent stanza in both A and B.[6]

Similarly, C1 and C4 can be resolved into a hyperarchetype C1-C4. Aside from readings altered by bowdlerization, C1 and C4 invariably agree with each other against C2-C3. It is true that in line 15, where the third word is "his" in C1 and "its" in C2-C3, the first word in C4 is "Its"; but this reading of C4 may well have resulted from the bowdlerization of lines 15 and 16 and should be disregarded. Thus the evidence sufficiently demonstrates that the state of the text represented by C2-C3 is in no sense intermediary between C1 and C4. Moreover, since C4 varies from C1 only in its bowdlerized readings, we must assume that the hyperarchetype C1-C4, so far as the available evidence can show, is verbally identical with C1. C4 is probably not derived from C1, however, for there is no other indication that the edition of 1691 depends upon Harvard MS. Eng. 636F. Nor is there reason to suspect that C4 was influenced by the readings of A2, even though many texts in the edition of 1691 are partially or wholly derived from one of the editions of 1680.

[6] My procedure in determining these two readings of C2-C3 entails some risks, since, as we shall see, C2-C3 and C1-C4 possibly descend from different authorial drafts. The risks are minor, however, because I base no further conclusions on these hypothetical readings and do not choose C2-C3 as *textus receptus*.

The foregoing conclusions narrow the possible relationships between C1-C4 and C2-C3 to three general types: (1) one state may descend from the other; (2) both may descend independently from an authorial draft or an archetype which is descended from an authorial draft; (3) each may descend from a different authorial draft. Before these three possibilities can be explored, however, it is necessary to establish the relationships among versions A, B, and C.

III

Close comparison of the three versions of "To a Lady in a Letter" leaves little doubt that version A is the earliest, version B an intermediate draft in process of revision, and version C the product of this revision. The total variational pattern is enough to suggest that version B is intermediary between A and C. Though B agrees extensively with A against C and with C against A, in only three substantive readings do A and C agree against B. Each of these three readings affects only a single word, and all are special cases: one, which may be a slip of Rochester's pen, is a difference between singular and plural (line 27 of C), another is an obscene term (line 24 of C), and the third is part of a larger variant which does not support the agreement of A and C against B (line 2). This evidence is stronger than may appear, since it is not uncommon for an author to adopt one reading in his first draft, substitute another in a second draft, and then return in a third draft to his original choice. More important, however, three major sets of variants indicate not only that B is intermediary between A and C but that the direction of change is from A through B to C. These variants must be examined in detail.

(1) In the holograph text B1, as noted earlier, the symbols appearing between stanzas 2 and 3 and between stanzas 6 and 7 evidently indicate that the last two stanzas, which are out of place at the end of the poem, were to be inserted after the second stanza. Comparison with versions A and C confirms this conclusion. Except for variants involving less than one line each, the first six stanzas of text B1 correspond exactly to the full six stanzas of version A. Also, two stanzas corresponding to the last two in text B1 actually appear after the second stanza in version C. Though version C exhibits considerable varia-

tion in these added lines, it retains the rhyme-words of B1 in the first of the two stanzas, and in both stanzas its general sense is recognizably similar.

Apparently Rochester's intention in adding the two stanzas was to reinforce and extend the poem's wittily outrageous plea for separate but equal debauchery. Like a Metaphysical poem, his song turns on the conceit that though the speaker and his mistress pursue their separate pleasures of wine and love, they are united by their common hedonism. This designedly specious argument culminates in an ironic echo of Lovelace's famous lines:

> For did you love your pleasure lesse
> You were noe Match for mee.

In version A, as Rochester may have felt, the opposed interests of Bacchus and Venus give the impression of being yoked by too much violence; the force pushing them apart seems greater than the force striving to hold them in tension. In version B, the two added stanzas strengthen the linkage by introducing the idea that only wine can inspire love-poetry. In version C, this idea is discarded in favor of a parallel between the respective "liquors" of wine and love.

(2) In the initial line of text B1, the canceled reading "happy" is that of version A, whereas the preferred reading "perfect" is found in version C. Rochester's revisions of the first two lines of the poem seem aimed at greater verbal exactness. In version A he wrote "How happy Cloris (were they free) | Might our Enjoyments prove." In text B1 he altered this to "How happy Cloris, & how free | Would these enjoyments prouve"—which is scarcely any better. Then, however, he struck out "happy" and substituted the more precise word "perfect." In version C, his final draft, he adopted the syntactically tighter "Such perfect Blisse faire Chloris, wee | In our Enjoyment(s) prove."

(3) A similar deletion and correction occurs in text B1 at line 23. The last two lines of version A are a parallel between "The lusty Juice of Grapes" and "The lusty Juice of Men." The parallel in ideas is so obvious, however, that the complete rhetorical parallelism is rather wooden, nor does it exploit the richer effects attainable through such devices as chiasmus. Accordingly, in text B1 Rochester tried altering

the first phrase to "The juice of Lusty grapes." Since the revised reading is not very satisfactory, he struck it out, wrote the original reading above it, and altered the second phrase to "The juice of Lusty Men." These are the readings of version C.

A detailed list of the variants separating versions A, B, and C should be given both to document clearly the conclusions reached in preceding paragraphs and to show the nature of Rochester's revisions. Included are all important variants of the hyperarchetypes C1-C4 and C2-C3, since we have not yet determined which of these readings are authoritative. The line-numbering follows version C.

Song *A* → *no title B* → To A Lady, in A Letter *C1-C4*; Against jealousie *C2-C3*

1 How happy Cloris (were they free) *A* → How happy Cloris, & how free *B* → How perfect Cloris, & how free *B* → Such perfect Blisse faire Chloris, wee *C*

2 Might our Enjoyments *A* → Would these enjoyments *B* → In our Enjoyment *C1-C4*; in our enjoyments *C2-C3*

3 But you wth formall *A, B* → 'Tis pitty restless *C*

4 Are still tormenting *A, B* → Should Mingle with our *C*

5 instructs *A, B* → has taught *C*

7 If Rivall Bottle you'll *A, B* → You Rivall Bottle must *C*

8 I'll *A, B, C1-C4*; *I C2-C3*

9-16 *added B, C*

9 Upraide mee not *B* → Thinke not in this *C*

10 Tricks to delude y^{r} *B* → A Treason 'gainst Loves *C1-C4*; treason against love's *C2-C3*

11 running after mirth & *B* → following y^{e} God of *C*

12 y^{r} Longing *B* → my Chloris *C*

13 For wine (whose power alone can raise *B* → Since you have that for all your hast *C*

14 Our thoughts soe farr above) *B* → Att which I'le ne're repine *C*

15 Affords Idea's fitt to praise *B* → Will take his Likour of as fast *C1-C4*; Will take its liquor off as fast *C2-C3*

16 What wee thinke fitt to Love *B* → As I can take of mine *C1-C4*; as I do take off mine *C2-C3*

20 The Coxcomb for *A* → Him out to be *B, C*

21 You never *A, B* → Nor doe you *C*

22 nor *A, B* → and *C*

24 Codds *A* → $\overset{\text{backs}}{\text{purse}}$ *B* → Codds *C*
26 we'll not *A, B* → wee nere *C1-C4*; we'd ne'r *C2-C3*
27 pleasure *A* → pleasures *B* → pleasure *C*
28 not fit *A, B* → noe Match *C1-C4*; no mate *C2-C3*
29 While *A* → Whilst *B, C*
29 Passion *A, B* → pleasure *C*
30 Am whole Nights *A, B* → Whole nights am *C*
31 lusty Juice of *A* → juice of Lusty *B* → Lusty juice of *B, C*
32 lusty Juice of *A* → juice of Lusty *B, C*

This list of revisions prompts at least one further observation which might, to be sure, have been gathered from Rochester's other works: as a poet, he is noteworthy for his discriminating ear and his sure touch. Though many of his revised readings will seem, to the average ear, neither better nor worse than the words he canceled, they must have appealed to his superior sensitivity to language. Also, the list reveals very few instances in which Rochester altered a reading, then returned later to his original thought. Evidently he possessed rare facility in finding exactly the words he wanted to body forth his conceptions.

IV

The final paradox of the early texts of "To a Lady in a Letter" is a frustrating joke on Rochester's editors: version C, which an editor is bound to adopt, is the only one of the three versions whose variants cannot be resolved with full confidence. The evidence fails to indicate clearly whether the states represented by the two hyperarchetypes are descended one from the other, related collaterally through an archetype, or descended separately from different authorial drafts. Since editors must render decisions in such matters, however, there is no choice but to consider the available arguments, inconclusive though they may be.

In the absence of better data, the relationship of version C to versions B and A offers a makeshift test that may help to identify corrupt variants in the two hyperarchetypes. Wherever C1-C4 and C2-C3 differ in their readings, the variant which agrees with version B or with both B and A is probably authentic, whereas the other variant may be corrupt. Unfortunately, a peculiar circumstance reduces the useful-

ness of this test, for six of the eight unresolved pairs of variants occur in places where neither C1-C4 nor C2-C3 agrees with versions B and A. The remaining two cases, however, yield reasonably clear results. In line 2, the reading "enjoyments" in C2-C3 agrees with both B and A, whereas "Enjoyment" in C1-C4 does not. In line 8, "I'll" in C1-C4 agrees with B and A, whereas "I" in C2-C3 is unsupported. The readings "I" and "Enjoyment" are *prima facie* corruptions. Line 2 refers to the twin pleasures of love and wine, so that the plural form "enjoyments" is almost mandatory. "I'll" in line 8 gives a closer parallelism with the preceding line, and a more natural sequence of tenses.

These two pairs of variants also suggest that the states represented by the hyperarchetypes do not descend one from the other, since one corruption occurs in C1-C4 and the second in C2-C3. Normally, in determining manuscript stemmas, such minor variants should carry little weight; these, in particular, seem to result from inadvertent omissions of letters which could easily be resupplied by any number of later copyists working independently. On the other hand, the close relationship of C4 to C1 and of C3 to C2, together with the notable lack of any other texts of version C, argues that this version was not copied extensively and that the two pairs of variants may therefore be significant. Furthermore, if the states represented by the hyperarchetypes were ancestor and descendant, all variants in the descendant would be corruptions, and some of them, at least, should be obviously incorrect. This condition does not obtain, for in each of the six unresolved pairs of variants, the readings of C1-C4 and C2-C3 are both plausible.

Again, if the hyperarchetypes descend independently either from a single authorial draft or from an archetype descended in its turn from an authorial draft, the variants in both C1-C4 and C2-C3 should ordinarily include some evident corruptions. This, we have seen, is true only of the readings "I" and "Enjoyment." Even these two incorrect readings may have been present in separate drafts from Rochester's own hand. In the holograph text B1, Rochester similarly drops the final letters of "flutters" (line 10) and "your" (line 19). Possibly he was prone to this type of error, at least during the interval when he was transcribing "To a Lady in a Letter." Moreover, the occurrence of so many unresolved pairs of variants at places where version C differs from versions B and A may hold some significance: these are

exactly the places where Rochester, having revised the readings of B, is most likely to have continued revising after he completed his earliest draft of C. On the whole, then, the evidence slightly favors the conclusion that C1-C4 and C2-C3 descend from separate authorial drafts, and consequently that we possess not just three, but four authoritative versions of the poem.

Fortunately, a sort of *deus ex machina* rescues an editor at this point, for special circumstances virtually require him to adopt hyperarchetype C1-C4 as preserved in text C1, altering it only by correcting "Enjoyment" to a plural. Three arguments support this procedure.

(1) Since C1-C4 and C2-C3 may descend from separate authorial drafts, one of the two should be chosen and its readings followed consistently; an editor should not attempt to combine readings which may stem from different holograph texts. This decision has the additional advantage of avoiding the risks of eclecticism. Readings from one of the two hyperarchetypes should not be substituted in the other unless, as with "I" and "Enjoyment," the rejected reading is apparently a corruption whose origin is explicable in terms of the preferred reading.

(2) Since both extant descendants of C2-C3 lack the last stanza and probably bowdlerize at least one more word, C1-C4 is by far the better choice as *textus receptus*, other considerations being equal.

(3) Subjective criteria appear to favor the readings of C1-C4. Though the variants in C2-C3 may be authoritative, those in C1-C4 are in all instances just as good, and in some instances better; possibly they are later revisions. In line 28, "Match" (C1-C4) expresses the sense more precisely than "mate" (C2-C3). In line 26, "wee" (C1-C4) gives a better sequence of tenses than "we'd" (C2-C3). In line 16, "do" (C2-C3) is a weak expletive, whereas "can" (C1-C4) is functional. In line 15, "its" (C2-C3) is ambiguous, since it might refer to "that" in line 13; the implied antecedent of "his" (C1-C4), as Rochester probably intended, is the god of love in line 10. In line 10, "treason against" (C2-C3) involves a trochaic substitution which would be unusual in this song; "A Treason 'gainst" preserves the regularity of the meter. The inclusion or omission of stanza numbers is immaterial, and the choice of titles is perhaps indifferent—though the heading in C1-C4 may indicate that Rochester actually sent this version in a letter to one of his mistresses.

For reasons too complex to outline here, full modernization of accidentals seems the least unsatisfactory form for a modern edition of Rochester's poetry. The following text of his song, one hopes, prints its substantive readings for the first time in their pristine impurity.

To a Lady in a Letter

Such perfect bliss, fair Chloris, we
  In our enjoyments prove,
'Tis pity restless jealousy
  Should mingle with our love.

Let us, since wit has taught us how,
  Raise pleasure to the top:
You rival bottle must allow;
  I'll suffer rival fop.

Think not in this that I design
  A treason 'gainst love's charms,
When following the god of wine
  I leave my Chloris' arms,

Since you have that, for all your haste
  (At which I'll ne'er repine),
Will take his liquor off as fast
  As I can take off mine.

There's not a brisk, insipid spark
  That flutters in the town,
But with your wanton eyes you mark
  Him out to be your own;

Nor do you think it worth your care
  How empty and how dull
The heads of your admirers are,
  So that their cods be full.

All this you freely may confess,
  Yet we ne'er disagree,
For did you love your pleasure less,
  You were no match for me.

Whilst I, my pleasure to pursue,
  Whole nights am taking in
The lusty juice of grapes, take you
  The juice of lusty men.

Mark Catesby: The Discovery of a Naturalist

By George F. Frick

MARK Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina, Florida, and the Bahama Islands*[1] is almost unique among the eighteenth-century treatments of the flora and fauna of British North America. As a work of art and as a scientific achievement, it deserved the praise of Richard Pulteney, the historian of English botany, who, writing later in the century, called it "the most splendid of its kind that England had produced."[2] A splendid book it was, even though Catesby was at best a self-taught artist whose work betrayed his lack of training by its frequent crudities and inaccuracies. In spite of these defects, Catesby was an artistic innovator of considerable importance. He broke with the tradition of zoological illustration which displayed figures in stiff profile and gave to many of his drawings a sense of vitality and motion. More than this, he originated, almost a century before Audubon, the genre of bird art which the later delineator of American birds would follow with greater skill and to greater fame. It was Catesby who first placed his birds against botanical backgrounds which were realistic and not stylized and which were generally ecologically correct.[3]

Mark Catesby did more than create a magnificent picture book. Unlike many pre-Linnaean natural histories, his great work did not become quaint and obsolete after the revolution wrought in the biological sciences by the great Swedish taxonomist. Indeed it was Linnaeus himself, along with many of his late eighteenth and early nine-

[1] (2 v., London, 1731-43 [1729-47]). Some of the material on Catesby will be expanded in George F. Frick and Raymond P. Stearns, *Mark Catesby: The Colonial Audubon*, to be published by the University of Illinois Press. The author wishes to thank the officials of the Pierpont Morgan Library for making material available and the Library Company of Philadelphia, the American Philosophical Society, and Rutgers University for research grants which made this article possible.

[2] *Historical and Biographical Sketches of the Progress of Botany in England* (2 v., London, 1790) II, 226.

[3] See Robert H. Welker, *Birds and Men* (Cambridge, Mass., 1955) p. 13.

teenth-century successors, who helped to maintain Catesby's *Carolina* as a living scientific work. Linnaeus and other later naturalists based many designations of American species upon Catesby's plates and descriptions; and their modern followers, ornithologists particularly, but other zoologists and botanists as well, have had to refer to Catesby for solutions to problems in classification and nomenclature.[4]

While the *Natural History of Carolina* has continued to be known and used by scientists as well as collectors, Mark Catesby has remained a shadowy, half-known figure. Some of the obscurity which surrounds the man may be penetrated by a careful examination of material found in the Pierpont Morgan Library copy of his great book.

This set has a curious provenance, one very close to Catesby, which enhances not only its intrinsic value but also its worth as a source of information about him. The volumes belonged to Thomas Pennant (1726-98), topographer, antiquary, and naturalist, who wrote: "These books colored by the Author I bought from his Nephew Mr. Catesby, Haberdasher in Henrietta street, Convent [*sic*] Garden, April, 1766, together with some of the original drawings."[5] Catesby's nephew, Jekyll Catesby (d. 1786), had, in turn, probably received the first volume from the hands of the author, while the second came to him by bequest of Mark's widow, "to make his sett compleat."[6]

The identification of the "original" materials in these two volumes poses something of a problem, because both were interleaved with additional water-color drawings, prints, and manuscripts by many hands. This copy of *The Natural History of Carolina* bears the marks of continued use by Thomas Pennant and his son David (d. 1841), his literary executor, both of whom used it to file materials related to those which Catesby had published. At the end of the first volume, for example, Thomas Pennant laid a manuscript index of the "Birds and other Animals in Catesby's Carolina reduced to the Linnaean sys-

[4] Elsa Guerdrum Allen, *The History of American Ornithology before Audubon* (*American Philosophical Society Transactions* XLI, pt. 3, Philadelphia, 1951), 468; Witmer Stone, "Mark Catesby and the Nomenclature of North American Birds," *Auk* LVI (1929), 447-54.

[5] *Carolina* I, front flyleaf. The name "Jekyll Catesby" is written on the verso of pl. 100.

[6] "Will of Elizabeth Catesby . . . ," P. C. C. Searle [5 Searle 803: 240] (MS. in Principal Probate Registry, London) p. 237; *The Registers of St. Paul's Church, Covent Garden, London* (*Publications of the Harleian Society, Registers* XXXIII-VII, London, 1906-09) XXXV, 191, 198-99; XXXVII, 12, 144.

tem,"[7] while David made similar identifications, sometimes with references to Alexander Wilson and other later American ornithologists, on nearly every plate. There is even an indication that the elder Pennant received a part of his ornithological education from *The Natural History of Carolina*, for among the many additional drawings are three crude pen and water-color sketches, one of which bears his notation, "Copied when I was a child from a Catesby in the possession of Wynne of Goss esqr."[8]

Some of the added materials in these volumes are, however, undoubtedly Catesby's. In this category are manuscript versions in the author's hand of all or parts of the descriptions which were printed on five pages (4, 10, 11, 16, 19) of the Appendix to the *Natural History*. While all of them differ slightly from the printed version—they belonged to an age of imaginative and erratic punctuation and spelling—they can reasonably be assumed to be near or even to be the actual copies from which the printers worked on this rather miscellaneous addition to the main work. The careful proofreading, using contemporary symbols and in a contemporary hand, which all but one of these pages bear, testifies strongly to the probability.

The "original drawings" of which Pennant wrote are three in number. The first of these, Catesby's "Bead Snake" (so labeled by him) is apparently a very early version of the figure which he engraved for the book.[9] The drawing lacks the sweet potato plant around which it twines in the published plate, differs from it in the curl of the tail, and is reversed from the published form. This latter difference is illustrative of Catesby's engraving methods and of one of his weaknesses as an engraver of scientific subjects. He apparently worked directly from his drawings to the copper plates. The consequent reversal of the print was unimportant in the case of animals but resulted in inaccuracies in depicting such plants as the relatives of the morning glory (the sweet

[7] *Carolina* I, bound at back of volume. Each volume also has the printed Linnaean index from *Carolina* ([ed. 3], London, 1771). For the Pennants, see *DNB* and Thomas Pennant, *Literary Life of the Late Thomas Pennant* (London, 1793).

[8] *Carolina* I, opp. pls. 50, 59, 97. Most of these additions have now been removed from the P. M. L. copy but are cited here where originally placed. I have not been able to identify "Wynne of Goss."

[9] *Carolina* II, 60. The "Bead Snake" is probably the Corn Snake, *Elaphe guttata* (Linnaeus).

potato is one), whose petals in the bud and whose stems consistently twist in given directions.[10]

The second of these drawings is of the Catesbaea, named for the author by his correspondent J. F. Gronovius of Leyden, whose *Flora Virginica* (Leyden, 1739-43) was the first major attempt to apply the Linnaean system of vegetable classification to North American plants.[11] This drawing is almost identical with the published plate, lacking only the butterflies which grace the latter. It may, in fact, as it is not reversed, be a copy of the plate rather than an early version of it. Even so modest a man as Mark Catesby may not have been able to resist copying by hand the figure by which he was honored.

The final drawing, the *Kalmia angustifolia* (App. 17), which (unlike the other two) lacks an autograph label, can be identified only by other means. It is similar in style to other drawings by Mark Catesby, it is reversed (surely no copyist would do this), and it is drawn on the same paper as that used in *The Natural History of Carolina*. This shrub stands alone on the page, with its top unbroken, quite unlike the figure on the engraved plate which seems to have been crowded in as an afterthought with the striking illustration of its more spectacular relative, the *Rhododendron maximum*.

While these manuscripts and drawings are of importance in showing Mark Catesby at work, they tell us nothing of his life. This want is well supplied, however, by still another item which Thomas Pennant inserted in his copy of *The Natural History of Carolina*, a letter to him from George Edwards, printed below. In it Edwards clears up some of the problems surrounding Mark Catesby's early years and then gives a description of Catesby's death which helps to establish, beyond any doubt, its time and place. The letter does more than this, however, since it illustrates an unbroken line of descent of British naturalists from John Ray, through Mark Catesby and George Edwards, to Thomas Pennant.

John Ray (1627-1705), the first in time and in ability of this quartet, was, without doubt, the greatest English naturalist of the seven-

[10] H. A. Allard, "The Direction of the Twist of the Corolla in the Bud, and the Twining of the Stems in Convulvaceæ and Dioscoreaceæ," *Castanea* XII (1947), 88-94; William T. Stearn, "Publication of Catesby's Natural History . . . ," *Journal of the Society for the Bibliography of Natural History* III (1958), 328.

[11] *Carolina* II,100. The species is *C. spinosa* Linnaeus.

teenth century.[12] He is best remembered as a botanist, particularly for his *Historia plantarum* (London, 1686-1704); but he must also be deemed a great zoologist, even though his reputation in this field was long dimmed by the deference he paid his friend, patron, and co-worker, Francis Willughby. Ray's work continued to dominate among the practitioners of natural history in England through the first five or six decades of the eighteenth century and, although Linnaeus himself adapted much of Ray to his own use, slowed the acceptance of the Linnaean system by Englishmen.

We can defer for a moment further consideration of Mark Catesby and turn instead to George Edwards (1694-1773), who, with his *Natural History of Uncommon Birds* (London, 1743-51) and *Gleanings of Natural History* (London, 1758-64), succeeded Catesby as England's foremost ornithological illustrator. In many ways his work was superior to that of his predecessor; it was more accurate and frequently "prettier," although it lacked the ecological sense and vigor which Catesby's best plates displayed. Edwards was in a position to know his fellow artist, as the two men maintained a coöperative relationship for approximately the last ten years of Catesby's life and did so despite the fact that their works were partly competitive. Edwards particularly was the beneficiary of this coöperation, for it was Catesby who instructed his younger colleague in the secrets of engraving and thus, in a sense, made Edwards's works possible.[13] Catesby was also a sponsor for Edwards's abortive first attempt at membership in the Royal Society.[14] Beyond this, Catesby supplied Edwards with specimens of birds, non-American species, which would have been inappropriate in *The Natural History of Carolina,* but which mingled easily with the much more diverse collections in *The Natural History of Uncommon Birds.*[15] Whether Edwards was able to reciprocate in kind is doubtful. He did lend his name and possibly his talents to the rather small revisions made in the second English edition (London, 1754) of Catesby's book; but this was of no advantage either to Catesby, who was dead, or to his heirs, who had disposed of his plates to the booksellers.

[12] Materials on Ray taken from Charles E. Raven, *John Ray Naturalist* (Cambridge, 1942).

[13] Edwards, *Uncommon Birds* I, xii-xiii.

[14] Certificates, I, 286 (MS. in Library of Royal Society).

[15] Edwards, *Uncommon Birds* I, 27-31; II, 63; III, 109.

George Edwards was, however, of considerable assistance to the fourth generation of naturalists involved here, Thomas Pennant. Pennant was a man of many literary talents, of which the most memorable was perhaps his ability as the author of "travels." His reputation in this field is well-founded, for we have the word of no less an expert than Dr. Johnson that Pennant was "a Whig, Sir; a sad dog . . . but . . . the best traveller I ever read. . . ."[16] While his travels have maintained their luster, Pennant should not be ignored as a compiler of natural history. This Welsh country gentleman was, in fact, the leading British naturalist between Ray and Darwin. At the time (Dec. 1761) Edwards wrote to him, Pennant had only recently started work on his first major effort in natural history, his *British Zoology*. According to Pennant, Edwards "at first conceived a little jealousy on my attempt, but it very soon subsided."[17] That it subsided quickly is obvious from the letter, which shows not only Edwards's acceptance of his younger competitor, but also his active assistance in the preparation of the book. But while Edwards's letter does document this relationship between him and Pennant, its most important parts are those which deal with Mark Catesby.

Mark Catesby was, as Edwards wrote, born of a "gentiel Family" at the home of his mother, Elizabeth Jekyll, at Castle Hedingham, Essex, 24 Mar. 1682/3.[18] Both the Jekylls and Catesbys were families bred to the law, although Mark seems to have been trained in no profession. His father, John Catesby, was a lawyer, politician, and magistrate in Sudbury, Suffolk, a few miles across the River Stour from Castle Hedingham.[19] The Jekylls frequently combined the practice of law with antiquarian pursuits and also, in the case of Mark's uncle, Nicholas Jekyll, with the cultivation of a botanical garden.[20]

The question of how Mark Catesby developed an interest in nat-

[16] James Boswell, *Life of Johnson* (ed. Hill, rev. Powell, 6 v., Oxford, 1934-50), III, 274.

[17] Pennant, *Literary Life*, p. 3.

[18] Allen, *American Ornithology*, p. 469, assumes that the date, 24 Mar. 1682, means 1681/2, but this is unlikely as Catesby was baptized 30 Mar. 1683, six days later by the Julian calendar.

[19] See Charles F. D. Sperling, *A Short History of the Borough of Sudbury* . . . (Sudbury, 1896) pp. 34, 78, 153.

[20] George Symonds Boulger, "Samuel Dale," *Journal of Botany, British and Foreign* XXI (1883), 193; Sperling, "Thomas Jekyll," *Essex Review* III (1894), 254-61.

ural history has troubled his biographers, as there is no concrete evidence of his schooling or early training. Presumably the example of his uncle's botanical avocation helped to create his "early Inclination . . . to search after Plants and other Productions in Nature. . . ." (*Carolina* I, v.) Edwards's account is significant in making the connection between the young Mark Catesby and John Ray. Ray lived a scant ten miles from Castle Hedingham, in the parish of Black Notley, so that Mark could have sat often at the feet of the patriarch of English natural history. Mark Catesby undoubtedly owed his introduction to Ray to Nicholas Jekyll, who had been acquainted with the great naturalist for some time, having supplied many of the additions to the second edition of Ray's *Collection of English Words*.[21]

Through Jekyll and Ray also, Mark Catesby came to know Ray's assistant and friend Samuel Dale (d. 1739), apothecary of Braintree, the author of a famous *Pharmacologia* (London, 1693). Dale visited Nicholas Jekyll's garden in 1711, almost on the eve of Mark Catesby's first departure for America; and it was quite probably at this time that Catesby arranged to send specimens to the apothecary.[22] At any rate, during the period 1712 to 1719 when he was in Virginia, Catesby sent collections to Dale. These specimens must have impressed Dale greatly, because even before Catesby's return to England in the fall of 1719, he began to enlist William Sherard (d. 1728) as a patron to finance further travels by Catesby in America.[23] Sherard, a talented botanist, now best remembered for the Oxford chair in botany that bears his name which he founded, was convinced by Dale and by Catesby's own efforts of Catesby's ability. He was primarily responsible for raising the subscription to send Mark Catesby to South Carolina in 1722, on the journey which would eventually result in *The Natural History of Carolina, Florida, and the Bahama Islands*.[24]

Catesby devoted most of the remainder of his life to the *Natural History*: nearly three years in the field in Carolina and most of another

[21] (London, 1691), second page of unpaged preface.

[22] Boulger, *Journal Botany* XXI, 193, 194.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 193; "Seeds from Virginia Sent by Mr. Catesby to Mr. Dale," British Museum, Sloane MS. 3339, fols. 73b-75; Dr. [William] Sherard's Philosophical Letters (MS. in Royal Society Library) II, 196, 198, 203, 204, 206a.

[24] Sherard Letters II, 211, 212, 215, 218; Dawson Turner, ed., *Extracts from the Literary and Scientific Correspondence of Richard Richardson* (Yarmouth, 1835) pp. 157-58.

in the Bahamas, and then the long struggle to translate the results of these travels into the finished work. In his single-minded devotion to his task, Catesby was indeed "under the frowns of fortune." Peter Collinson (d. 1768), the gentle Quaker merchant and ready patron of American science, lent the would-be author money without interest (here Edwards erred slightly).[25] Mark Catesby was thus able to devote his time to the *Natural History* and eventually, to live modestly from its sale. Even with this generous assistance, *The Natural History of Carolina* was entirely his book and, as such, required a tremendous effort on his part. With the aid of Joseph Goupy, a French-born watercolorist and etcher, he learned to engrave his own plates; and he did all but two of the 220 pictures in the finished work. Initially also, he colored these by hand and, even at a later time, when his resources were greater, supervised and retouched the coloring of all the painted copies.[26]

Given these circumstances, *The Natural History of Carolina* was long in the process of publication. Catesby published the work in eleven parts—originally there were to have been ten—each with twenty plates. The first of these was ready some three years after his return to England. On 22 May 1729, he carried it proudly to Crane Court to show the assembled Fellows of the Royal Society and to enlist subscribers for the succeeding parts.[27] By the end of Dec. 1731, the year of publication given on the title page of the first volume, only four of the five parts of that volume were finished. The fifth was not ready for delivery to the Royal Society until 23 Nov. 1732.[28] The second volume took even longer. The tenth and last part, as originally projected, was not ready for the Society until 15 Dec. 1743.[29] The Appendix, an afterthought which depended far more on the efforts of such collectors as

[25] Peter Collinson, MS. statement in his copy of *Carolina* I, copied in hand of Aylmer Bourke Lambert (MS. in Linnaean Society of London).

[26] *Carolina* I, xi. An anonymous translator provided the parallel French text, and Georg Dionysius Ehret supplied pls. 61 and 96 of v. 2. Cromwell Mortimer, "An Account of Mr. Mark Catesby's Essay towards the Natural History of Carolina . . . ," *Philosophical Transactions* XXXVI (1730), 425; "A Continuation of an Account . . . ," *ibid.* XLV (1748), 173.

[27] Royal Society, Journal Book XIV (MS. in Royal Society Library), 336.

[28] Catesby to Elizabeth Jones, 30 Dec. 1731, in Lewis Hampton Jones, *Captain Roger Jones of London and Virginia* (Albany, N. Y., 1891 [1911]) pp. 218-19; R. S. Journal Book XV, 190.

[29] R. S. Journal Book XIX, 130.

Peter Collinson than on Catesby's own work in the field, was not completed until the spring or early summer of 1747.[30]

In the meantime, Mark Catesby took an honored if quiet place in the English natural history circle. He knew and exchanged intelligence with most of the leading figures of this group and carried on a correspondence with men of similar interests in Europe and America, though not on the grand scale of such of his friends and patrons as Peter Collinson and Sir Hans Sloane. He became a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1732, and, judging from the frequency of the appearance of his name in the Society's Journal Books, he was an active participant in its affairs, unlike many of the amateurs in science who swelled its numbers in this period. Catesby read letters from his correspondents at home and abroad,[31] reviewed Réaumur's *Histoire des insectes* and was asked to give an account of Linnaeus' first edition of *Systema naturae*,[32] displayed American curiosities,[33] and read papers—most notably his perceptive essay on the migration of birds, "Of Birds of Passage," as well as portions of his "Account of Carolina . . ." which were later included in his *Natural History*.[34]

Catesby's domestic life is far less clear than his public existence as reflected in the records of the Royal Society. He married Elizabeth Rowland, widow with a grown daughter, on 2 Oct. 1747. At the time of his death a little more than two years later, they had two children, Mark and Ann.[35] No records of their births seem to have survived, but

[30] Peter Collinson wrote Linnaeus, 16 Apr. 1747, "Catesby's noble work is finished." James Edward Smith, ed., *A Selection of the Correspondence of Linnaeus* (2 v., London, 1821) I, 18. Catesby presented the Appendix to the Royal Society on 2 July 1747 (R. S. Journal Book XX, 307).

[31] R. S. Letter Book XXIV (MS. in Royal Society Library), 115, 118; R. S. Journal Book XVI, 201-02, 219; XX, 66, 70-71. Two of the letters from Thomas Knowlton were published in the *Phil. Trans.* XLIV, pt. 1 (1746), 100-02, 124-27. Other letters were from William Byrd of Virginia, Johann F. Gronovius of Leyden, and Johann Amman of St. Petersburg.

[32] René Antoine Ferchault de Réaumur, *Memoirs pour servir à l'histoire des insectes* (6 v., Paris, 1734-42); Carl Linnaeus, *Systema naturæ* (Leyden, 1735); R. S. Journal Book XVI, 219, 295, 345, 358, 391; XVII, 80, 83, 338; XVIII, 107.

[33] R. S. Journal Book XV, 422; XVIII, 269.

[34] R. S. Journal Book XIX, 98-99, 101, 130; XX, 218-23; see "Of Birds of Passage," *Phil. Trans.* XLIV, pt. 2 (1747), 435-44.

[35] George J. Armytage, ed., *The Register of Baptisms and Marriages at St. George's Chapel May Fair* (*Publications of the Harleian Society, Registers* XV, London, 1889), 92; P. C. C. Searle.

George Edwards' statement that young Mark was a "Boy of 8 years old" indicates that he was born before the marriage of his father with Elizabeth Rowland. Quite probably, Ann was also. It is likely that both children were the issue of an earlier marriage, or that they were the products of a liaison between Mark and Elizabeth which preceded their formal vows (there is nothing to indicate that the children were not Elizabeth's own).

Whatever the facts of Catesby's life, those of his death have become extremely confused. For years, the date given in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 23 Dec. 1749, was accepted as the time of his demise. Recently, Elsa G. Allen, in her study of early American ornithology, raised a serious question when she discovered a will for a Mark Catesby which indicated that he was "going to the seas" aboard the East Indiaman *Portfield* and the record of his burial at sea on 20 Apr. 1750.[36] Edwards's account, though it mistakes the year, confirms the Dec. 1749 date and coincides with other reports about Catesby's health. He had been suffering for some time with circulatory ailments. In July 1749, Thomas Knowlton, gardener to the Earl of Burlington, wrote: "... poor Mr. Catesby's Legs swell and he looks badly. Drs. [Richard] Mead and [Thomas] Stack said there were little hopes of him long on this side of the grave."[37] This gloomy prognosis was perhaps premature; but Catesby's dropsy was symptomatic of conditions which caused his final seizure, while he walked with his son in Holborn, and his death a few days later. The modest author of *The Natural History of Carolina* had survived the completion of his noble work by little more than a year and a half. In many ways, his life ended with the publication of those elegant folio pages, for so much of it was bound up in them.

Letter: George Edwards to [Thomas Pennant]

Good Sir

You Must Excuse the Slowness of Age in not answering immediately on the receipt of your letters. I now intend to kill 3 birds with one Stone but may be Mistaken. I think I have receiv'd 3 letter from you Since I wrote to you.

[36] *Gent. Mag.* xx (1750), 30-31; Allen, *American Ornithology*, p. 477. The December date is also confirmed by Peter Collinson to Linnaeus, 8 May 1750, in Smith, ed., *Linnaeus Correspondence* I, 23-24.

[37] To Richard Richardson, 18 July 1749, in Turner, ed., *Richardson Correspondence* pp. 400-02.

I have carried the tringa with the Coot foot and the Coldfinch of My History Page 30[38] inclosed in a Chippbox and have left them with your friend at the Navey ofice as you directed.[39] Your favour of the Box of Birds is Safe arrived. The Manks Puffin is of that genus of Birds I have call'd Peterils. I beleive the Shear-water of Willughby, Page 334, is the same with the manks Puffin.[40] It is remarkable that the common Pufin has 16 feathers in its tail when the larger Species of that genus, the Auk and Gillemot, have only 12. I take the bill in the Sea pye to be only an accidental imperfection.[41] The water hen I have not before Seen.[42] I think it nearly agrees with Some of the Ittalian kinds Described by ray or Willughby. Shall take care to return them Safe the first opertunety. The Curious bill you Mention I have Seen at Millans.[43] As to My Late friend Catesby, he was of a Gentiel Famely in Essex, born at Castle Heningham in that County and Hapned in his youth to fall into the acquaintance of the great naturalist Mr. Ray, who then lived in Essex not far from him. This acquaintance inspir'd Catesby with a gen[i]us for natural history. His voyage to America was on the Subscriptions of Several Curious Gentlemen in London &c. as Mention in the Preface to his Hist of Carolina &c. He was many Years a fellow of the royal Society in whos transactions several of his papers are printed. I do not know that he was bred to any Profession. He was in his behavier much of a Gentleman and gained the respect of all his acquaintance. He was to Modest to rise in the world by Pushing his interest amongst the great, to many of whom he had Acces. He was under the frowns of fortune yet through his Great prudence and oeconomy Steared his cours to the end with out either runing in debt or being troublesom to his friends. He dyed regretted by all who knew his merrits, I think about the year 1747 or 8 and was buried in the Church yard of St Luke in Old street, London, where I attended his funeral. He lefft a Wife, a Son and Daughter yong. His whole fortune: household Stuff, Coppy of his histor[y],

[38] Tringa . . . is Grey Phalarope, *Phalaropus fulicarius* (Linnaeus); Coldfinch is Pied Flycatcher, *Muscicapa hypoleuca* (Pallas). Edwards credited Pennant with sending him the former, *Gleanings* II, 206-08. In this letter, punctuation has been modernized and abbreviations expanded where necessary for proper understanding.

[39] "My agent was that very honest man, Mr. Richard Morris, of the navy office," Pennant, *Literary Life*, p. 4.

[40] Manks Puffin is Manx Shearwater, *Procellaria puffinus* Brünich, which Edwards received from Pennant; *Gleanings* III, 313-15. Edwards refers here to John Ray, *The Ornithology of Francis Willughby* . . . (London, 1678) and later also to Ray's *Synopsis methodica avium* . . . (London, 1713).

[41] Sea Pye is Oystercatcher, *Haematopus ostralegus* Linnaeus; see Pennant, *British Zoology* (ed. 4, 4 v., London, 1776-77) II, 405.

[42] Water Hen is Moorhen, *Galinula chloropus* (Linnaeus); see *British Zoology* (ed. 4) II, 411.

[43] John Millan, bookseller and collector, d. 1784; H. R. Plomer, *et al., Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers . . . 1726-1775* (Oxford, 1932) pp. 40-41.

original drawings, and Copper plates did not amount in the whole to 700£. I believe he was turn'd of 70 when he dyed. Whither his death was natural or acidental, it is hard to determin. In Crossing the way in holbore, he fell and was taken up Senceless and So continued 2 or 3 days, when he dyed. He receiv'd in his fall a bruse in his head which might caus his death, or the fall might be from an appoplectic fit. He had his son with him, a Boy of 8 years old, who could give no Satisfactory account. He was put in to a Coach and carried home to his wife in that Condition. I am promised More Circumstantial Memores by one Mr. Catesby, a Nephew of his in town.[44] I know nothin about albins Sir Thomas Lowther,[45] but his things were since Purchased by Dr. Mead.[46] I know them by Albins figures. They are very bad things, to bad to be published. They ware, since the death of Dr. Mead, bought by Sir Francis St. John[47] and, since his death, by Mr. Brown a Citison on fish street hill, London. They have in their travels accumulated Leonard Baltnes of Strasburg's[48] Original drawings and som very curious Colour'd Drawings of birds &c. by Others and are now bound in 3 Vols. folio. Mr. James Leman of London[49] has a Most Curious collection of Stuffed birds in great perfection, but he is a very od uncommunicative man that ever lived. He will neither Send, Sell, Give, or Show them to any that desire to see them. Masel[50] has call'd for the Print you sent up with the birds and taken it home to make the amendments you have noted. I have Given him my Opinion and advice and half a dozen of My Black Prints, that he may See my manner of Etching, tho I really think his etching is full as good as mine. As to his Stroaks, they are finer and Closer. Where prints are to be Colour'd, the Colouring makes the Stroaks appear much les harsh than when the prints are uncolour'd. He will Send a black print of Mine with a proof Print of the Pufin when he has corrected your Plate. I thank you for a Sight of your Drawings of Insects. Shall be carefull to keep them clean and return them Safe. I Shall be Glad of any information relating to the blew hawk or any other bird. When you

[44] Jekyll Catesby.

[45] Lowther supplied many specimens for Eleazer Albin's *Natural History of Birds* (3 v., London, 1738). He is probably the M. P. for Lancaster who died in 1745; *Gent. Mag.* XV (1745), 164.

[46] Richard Mead (d. 1754), court physician, collector, and patron of Catesby and Edwards; *see DNB*.

[47] Died 1756, of Little Ayott, Herts.; *Gent. Mag.* XXVI (1756), 412.

[48] Leonhard Baltner or Baldner, a fisherman of Strassburg (d. 1694) who sold his pictures and descriptions of Rhenish birds to Francis Willughby for use in Willughby's *Ornithology*; see p. 6 of unpaged preface; Allen, *American Ornithology*, pp. 419-21.

[49] A collector (fl. 1720-60) who supplied many specimens to Edwards; see *Gleanings* I, 43, 78, 100; II, 111, 121, 201; III, 298, 324.

[50] Peter Mazell (fl. 1755-97) who engraved the plates for Pennant's *British Zoology* (ed. 1, 2 v., London, 1766); see *DNB*.

have Settled your more meterial Business you are ingaged in and which interupts your Studies of nature, I Shall be ready to add my mite towards accomplishing your design.[51] Monday last, the R[oyal] Society had their Annual Dinner in the temple hall, when I happened to Sitt by Mr. White,[52] who put on a Great Air of friendship and Value for me and press'd me very Much to Call and Dine and Spend a Day, now and than, that we together might consuld about a proper Generical classing of Birds. But I know him to be so wise in his own conceit, that I Shall not visit him to Expose my Opinions to his farther contempt.

I am Sir your very Humble Servant &c.

Geo. Edwards

College of Physicians, London
December 5, 1761

[51] Pennant's "design" was the first edition of *British Zoology*.

[52] Probably Taylor White, F. R. S. (d. 1772) who subscribed to Edwards's books and supplied him with specimens. *Gent. Mag.* XLII (1772), 199; *Gleanings* I, 4; II, 65, 76.

Bibliographical Notes

A Variant Edition of Ockham's "Summa Logicae"

In 1488 Johann Higman, a German printer in Paris, published an edition of a well-known text on logic, William Ockham's *Summa totius logicae*. The book is not uncommon and ordinarily would not deserve attention, but a peculiarity of the copy owned by the University of Pennsylvania seems worthy of a note.

The volume (Hain-Copinger *11948) is a folio of 126 leaves ($a\text{-}p^8, q^6$) printed in roman type (Haebler 1, British Museum 80R). In the Pennsylvania copy, however, the text on the two conjugate leaves b1 and b8 is printed in gothic. There is no obvious reason for this variation. The changes from one type to another do not correspond to any natural breaks in the text; in each case the change comes in the middle of a sentence, and once in the middle of a word. The text is complete and there are fifty-one lines on each of the four pages of this sheet, as on all other pages. It seems evident that the gothic type is also Higman's (Haeb. 8, BM 82G). The watermark on this sheet does not appear on any other sheet in the book.

This odd variant inspired a correspondence with other libraries owning copies of the book. Reports on twenty-four other copies have been received; only one, a copy (one of three) at the Stadtbibliothek Trier, has these same two leaves printed in gothic type. All the others are in roman throughout.

What is the explanation for this variant? Probably Higman stored his copies of the *Summa* in sheets, and at a considerably later time discovered that he had not printed enough sheets containing the conjugate leaves b1 and b8. To complete the copies for sale he set up and printed off the missing leaves. For how many copies would this have been economically feasible? I cannot answer this question, although the discovery of only two instances of the variant among twenty-five copies argues that it could not have been a large number. We can infer that Ockham's text was in steady demand in Paris at this time and commanded a good price.

Why did the printer use gothic instead of roman type? Victor Scholderer, in the British Museum's *Catalogue of Books Printed in the XVth Century* VIII, 130-31, notes that Higman used only one roman type during the fifteenth century, and this one only until 1490. He must have disposed of his only roman font before he discovered the need for printing the additional sheets and was forced to use a gothic type of about the same size—a type, according to Scholderer, in use in and after 1494.

LYMAN W. RILEY

University of Pennsylvania

Harvey Manuscripts

William Harvey's three major published works are but a segment of his total literary output, for there is reason to believe that perhaps as many as eighteen other treatises have existed in manuscript at one time or another. Today, only two are known to be extant; both are volumes of notes, and both are among the Sloane manuscripts in the British Museum. One, "Prelectiones Anatomiæ Universalis," which is his Lumleian lecture notes for 1616, was published in 1886, but the other, on the anatomy of muscles and local movement in animals, being notes for two separate books, remained unpublished until last year, when the second part appeared.[1]

Sir George Paget described this latter manuscript volume in a now rare pamphlet[2] over a century ago and pointed out that not all of Harvey's manuscripts could have been destroyed during the Civil War because he refers to some by title in his *De Circulatione Sanguinis* (1649) and *De Generatione Animalium* (1651). Indeed, in the first paragraph of the *De Circulatione Sanguinis* Harvey says that he intends to put his *Anatomia Medica* to press. Would that he had, for today it is unknown! Nevertheless, in 1684 Charles Goodall listed in his short biography of Harvey eleven "Learned Treatises" as though they were then in existence.[3] The last entry in Goodall's catalogue is the *Anatomia Medica* for which he gives such a full title—about forty words—as to make it seem likely that he had seen it, were it not that it is all but a fair copy of two passages in the first paragraph of the work on circulation. Even so, Goodall's list strengthens Paget's hopes of over a hundred years ago that more Harvey manuscripts may be turned up. In any event, it is clear that the republic of letters, to use one of Harvey's phrases, has been deprived of the majority of the works he wrote.

The following table is a checklist of Harvey's manuscripts, and registers, in addition to Harvey's own references, citations made by three seventeenth-century writers: Sir Charles Scarburgh,[4] John Aubrey,[5] and Charles Goodall. The tabulated references in Harvey's writings are in his *De Circulatione Sanguinis* and *De Generatione Animalium*, except for a reference to *De Respiratione* in the *De Motu Cordis* of 1628. He also mentioned this manuscript twice in *De*

[1] Harvey, William, *De Motu Locali Animalium*, 1627, ed. and trans. by Gweneth Whitteridge, Cambridge University Press, 1959.

[2] Paget, G. E., *Notice of an Unpublished Manuscript of Harvey*, London: Longmans, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1850.

[3] Goodall, Charles, *The Royal College of Physicians of London*, London: M. Flesher, 1684. Unnumbered pages; sig. [Ss 1b]-[Ss 2b].

[4] Payne, L. M., "Sir Charles Scarburgh's Harveian Oration, 1662," *Journal of the History of Medicine* XII (1957), 158.

[5] Aubrey, John, *Aubrey's Brief Lives* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1950) p. 128.

Generatione. Since the two extant manuscripts date from well before the plundering of Harvey's house in 1642 and since there are references to the manuscripts after 1642 and after the Great Fire of 1665, it seems entirely possible that more of them may yet be discovered, despite the fact that assiduous searchers have returned, up to now, empty-handed from the hunt.

There are variations of some of the titles amongst the references listed in the table but the variants are not given. Nevertheless, numbers 4 and 11 may be the same work; similarly, 6 and 12 could be duplicates. Methodical and extensive searching will certainly turn up more references, possibly more titles, and, hopefully, more manuscripts.

Frederick G. Kilgour

Yale Medical Library

A Checklist of Harvey Manuscripts

Title	*Harvey*	*Scarburgh (1662)*	*Aubrey (1680)*	*Goodall (1684)*
1. Anatomia Medica	x			x
2. De Amore, Libidine et Coitu Animalium	x			x
3. De Cerebro		x		
4. De Insectis		x	x	
5. De Motu ac Sensu Animalium		x		
6. { De Musculis / De Motu Locali / Animalium } -*extant*				
7. De Nutritionis Modo				x
8. De Pulmone		x		x
9. De Respiratione	x	x		x
10. De Vegetatione ac Vita		x		
11. Historia Multorum Animalium Præsertim Insectorum				x
12. Observationes de Motiuis Organis Animalium et Musculorum Fabrica				x
13. Observationes de Usu Lienis				x
14. Observationes Medicinales	x			x
15. A Practice of Physick Conformable to his Thesis of the Circulation of the blood				x

16. Prelectiones Anatomiæ Universalis- *extant*
17. Physiologicus x
18. Tractatus de Quantitate Sanguinis x

The Early Quartos of Brome's "Northern Lasse"

Richard Brome's comedy, *The Northern Lasse*, was entered in the Stationers' Register on 24 Mar. 1632,[1] and was published later that year in quarto. In the six copies that I have examined, there are variant readings. The title page exists in three press-variant states: the Yale, Chapin, Newberry, and Library of Congress copies write "NICHOLAS VAVASOVR, dwelling" which is also Sir Walter Greg's transcript;[2] and this is the only reading that Greg lists. However, the Harvard copy has "NICHOLAS VAVASOVR dwelling" omitting the comma after the last name; and finally the Folger copy has "NICHOLAS VAVASOR, dwelling" omitting a "V" in the last name.

While the sheets of this quarto were passing through the press, several corrections were made in the outer forme of Sig. K. Although some of the changes are relatively minor—they include such things as the substitution of upper for lower case letters, and small emendations in the pointing—others would seem to show that great care was taken in the correction of the text. In the Yale and Chapin quartos, part of a speech reads:

> slip away with her in your Coach, where
> Master *Tridewell* hath appointed, till the Euening; and let mee
> alone to scuffle with the old man the while. And then I doubt
> not (K3^{r}

The Harvard quarto has a slightly altered reading:

> slip you away with her in your Coach,
> where M. *Tridewell* hath appointed, till the Euening; and let me
> alone to scuffle with the old man the while. And then I doubt
> not

Here the compositor made sure that the last lines on the page and the catchwords in both cases remained the same, or else he would have had to correct the inner forme of Sig. K.

In all six copies, the scene numbers in the last act are incorrect. In the Harvard, Folger, and Library of Congress quartos the eight scenes are written: 1,

[1] Edward Arber, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554-1640 A.D.* (London, 1887) IV, 241.

[2] *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration* (Oxford, 1951) No. 463.

2, 3, 5, 5, 7, 8, 9; but the Newberry, Chapin, and Yale quartos are numbered: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. Besides this, the stage direction on $K4^v$ (Harvard copy: scene five repeated; Yale copy: scene six) exists in three states. The Folger and Harvard copies are correct:

Act. V. *Sce.* v.
Enter *Squelch* to *Fitchow.*

The opening line of the scene is directed to Widow Fitchow. The Yale, Chapin, and Newberry quartos have merely:

Act. V. *Sce.* vi.
Enter *Squelch.*

The stage direction in the Library of Congress quarto is wrong:

Act. V. *Sce.* vi.
Enter *Squelch* to *Holdup.*

Constance Holdup, a prostitute, does not even appear in the scene.

This is not the only stage direction variant in the outer forme of Sig. K. On $K2^v$ of the Harvard, Folger, and Library of Congress quartos, the following appears:

Act. V. *Scene* ii.
Enter Traynwell and Lucklesse to them.

The Yale, Chapin, and Newberry copies have a shortened form:

Act. V. *Scene* ii.
Enter Traynwell and Lucklesse.

Although Lowndes and Fleay[3] each listed a 1635 quarto, they gave no source for their information; and no such edition is known to exist. The second quarto of *The Northern Lasse* was published in 1663; it is, by all indications, a straight resetting of the 1632 quarto.[4] No lines were added to the first edition, and none deleted; even the square brackets which were occasionally used in the first quarto (e.g. on $I1^r$, $L2^r$, and $L3^v$) instead of parentheses were duplicated in the second quarto. The only major change in the 1663 quarto shows that the printer read his copy-text carefully: the misnumbered scene in the first quarto, *Act.* V. *Sce.* v. (Sig. $K4^r$), was corrected to *Act.* V. *Sce.* iv. This emendation is most important in relation to the transmission of the seventeenth-century quartos of *The Northern Lasse.*

In my opinion, a first quarto similar to the Harvard and Folger copies was

[3] William Thomas Lowndes, *Bibliographical Manual of English Literature* (London, 1864) I, 280. Frederick Gard Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama 1559-1642* (London, 1891) II, 35.

[4] The second quarto is rather scarce, and I have been able to examine only two copies of it, Yale and the Boston Public Library. In my collation of these quartos, I have found no variant readings.

used as the copy-text for the third quarto of 1684: the similarities between the two editions are too great to be coincidental.[5] Two pieces of evidence will show how closely the printer of Q3 followed the text of Q1. I pointed out previously that the scenes are incorrectly numbered in the last act of the 1632 quarto; that three copies, the Folger, Harvard, and Library of Congress quartos, write: 1, 2, 3, 5, 5, 7, 8, 9; and that this error was corrected in the 1663 edition. In Q3, the printer carelessly copied the error found in Q1; and numbered the scenes in the same way. Finally, in the last scene of the comedy (Sig. M1^{v} in Q1), the phrase "Roarer, or Iierer" was modernized in Q2 to "Roarer, or Jeerer." This spelling was not adopted in Q3. The compositor of that edition either could not read his Q1 copy-text, or else he did not understand it as he wrote the nonsensical phrase "Roarer, or lieter." The Q3 printer could have mistaken an "l" for an "I" and a damaged seventeenth-century type "r" could easily be read as a "t"; but I doubt that an error of this kind could have occurred had the compositor followed the 1663 edition of *The Northern Lasse.*

HARVEY FRIED

Queens College, Flushing, New York

Establishing Berkeley's Authorship of "Guardian" Papers

The ascription of papers in *The Guardian* to Berkeley has been controversial for two centuries or more. Now, in the latest and presumably definitive edition of his works by Luce and Jessop[1] the problem is solved on the basis of internal evidence alone, analyzed some years ago in a lengthy article.[2] Luce's conclusions run thus: "There is a tradition, as old as the 1789 edition of *The Guardian*, that Dr. George Berkeley *fils* ascribed ten essays to his father, viz., Nos. 3, 27, 35, 39, 49, 55, 62, 70, 77 and 126. I do not think that the son studied the question carefully, and I doubt if he was really in a better position to judge than we are."[3] The editor then proceeds to exclude No. 3 and to add Nos. 83, 88, and 89, thus altering the "traditional" list by about twenty-five per cent. So does Luce, according to his personal selection, print the text of the papers stamped thus with Berkeley's name.

But the "traditional" element in the long controversy is very simply dis-

[5] I have examined four copies of the third quarto; they are at Yale, Harvard, Folger, and the Library of Congress. I have found no variant readings in any of them.

[1] *The Works of George Berkeley*, ed. A. A. Luce and T. E. Jessop, 9 v. (London, 1948-57). Vol. VII, which includes the *Guardian* essays, is edited by Professor Luce.

[2] A. A. Luce, "Berkeley's Essays in *The Guardian*," *Mind* LII (1943) 247-63, in which the case for his choices is ably argued.

[3] Luce, *op. cit.* in note 1 above, VII, 173.

pelled by the recovery of a brief but pertinent correspondence between none other than Thomas Percy and the younger Berkeley. Writes Percy:

Reverend Sir,

The Proprietors of the Spectator, Guardian, &c being about to publish a New Edition of these valuable Papers, have resolved to accompany them with a few notes & Illustrations; and to insert the names at length of such of the occasional writers as they can discover: For this purpose application has been made to many persons of distinction in the literary world, who have favoured the undertaking to the utmost of their power; & have furnished various articles of intelligence. As the Care of the edition is intrusted to me, I take the liberty to apply to you in [*sic*] behalf of the Public, that you would be pleased to inform us what Papers, Letters &c in the above Works, were contributed by your late excellent Father. That many essays in the *Guardian* flowed from his elegant pen we are expressly informed in the Preface: and it is commonly believed that the *Spectator* also was under some obligation to him. You probably can point out every particular Number &c & can perhaps afford us some particular illustrations on many passages in those & other parts of these works.[4]

Without attempting to evaluate this communication, of obvious interest in several respects, we read the reply:[5]

Rev[d] Sir,

A long absence from this, the usual, place of my residence, & an inflamation in one eye which for some time after my return into Berkshire prevented my writing, must plead my excuse for thus late acknowleging the receipt of your letter.

I wish it was in my power to be more satisfactory than it is, in replying to your queries—The following Numbers in the Guardian were as I apprehend written by my Father—

[4] This letter is a copy in Percy's hand, without date, place, or superscription, now in Bodleian MS. Percy d. 10, f. 52. Like the following reply from Berkeley Junior, it is one of 31 items in a guard-book of Percy manuscripts. It was part of item 411 in Thomas Thorp's Catalogue No. 316, and was acquired by the Bodleian 17 Nov. 1956. For permission to quote these letters and for the data regarding them I am indebted to the officials of the Bodleian Library.

[5] *Ibid.*, f. 53. Percy wrote to Farmer on 20 Apr. 1765: "I have lately had a letter from M[r] Berkeley, son to the celebrated Bishop of Cloyne, informing me what papers in the *Guardian* were writ by his father." *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Richard Farmer*, ed. Cleanth Brooks (Louisiana State University Press, 1946) p. 89. Professor Brooks explains (pp. 72-73, n.) that Percy cancelled his contract for editing *The Spectator*, *Guardian*, and *Tatler* on becoming chaplain to the Duke of Northumberland. His materials were given to John Calder, and Nichols published the editions of *The Spectator* and *Guardian* in 1789. Among the papers used in the edition of *The Guardian* it was the younger Berkeley's letter—now at last come to light—that gave rise to the "tradition." Luce calls the list of Berkeley's contributions therein a "traditional list" because the letter disappeared without being quoted except for the numbers of the essays. Hence his remark in the article in *Mind* (p. 252) cited above, "I have not succeeded in tracing the tradition to its source," that is, in the sense of seeing the original or a transcript.

It is interesting that Percy's letter of inquiry tends to bear out the defense of Percy as a careful scholar in Professor Brooks's highly suggestive article "The Country Parson As Research Scholar: Thomas Percy 1760-1770," *PBSA* 53: 219-39 (1959).

1st Vol. No—3—27—35—39—49—55—62—70—77————
2d Vol. No—126.

I am, Reverend Sir, your
most obedient humble Servant

Bray 27th March 1765. Ge˙ Berkeley.

The address is: "To The Revd Mr Percy | at Messrs Tonsons Booksellers | in the Strand | London"

Here then is the source of the "tradition." It is a source which should carry reasonable conviction and settle the canon once and for all.

It remains only to clear the younger Berkeley of the implied charge of irresponsibility in Professor Luce's statement, "I do not think that the son studied the question carefully, and I doubt if he was really in a better position to judge than we." Do we detect here a trace of scholarly frustration and a natural rationalization to disguise it? The point is that the son had no *need* to "study the question carefully," and we certainly challenge the assertion that he was not "in a better position to judge than we are." Did it never occur to Professor Luce that here is not a question of judgment from internal evidence only, but of family records? He implies that the son was irresponsible in offering a list composed of his own individual selections. Such an assumption contradicts all that we know of Dr. George Berkeley Junior, a conscientious scholar of no mean ability.[6]

How then did he arrive at his enumeration? Very likely, I should suppose, from the personal notations by his father or his wife,[7] such as simple inscriptions in a volume of *The Guardian*. In any event the son was made fully aware of his responsibility by Percy's explicit appeal for authoritative identification of the relevant papers. Upon his word depended determination of the Berkeley papers to be disclosed publicly for the first time. Percy assumed as a matter of course that the younger Berkeley would have the information and he addressed his appeal obviously in full confidence that his assumption was correct.

So the controversy is at last ended. *Guardian* paper No. 3 must be restored; and Nos. 83, 88, and 89 must find another author. By a simple brief statement from the right source a "tradition" becomes a certainty.

Paul Kaufman

University of Washington Library

[6] His publications include religious pamphlets and a volume of sermons published by his wife after his death in 1795.

[7] Eliza Berkeley, an extraordinary woman of intellectual attainments, great energy, and intense pride in the writings of any member of her family, would have been concerned with the essays of her father-in-law.

A Census of Matthew Arnold's "Poems" (1853)

Matthew Arnold's third volume of collected poetry, *Poems* (1853), has never received proper attention from bibliographers and book collectors. Since the publication of Thomas Burnett Smart's *Bibliography of Matthew Arnold* (London: Davy, 1892), emphasis, because of a supposed scarcity, has been placed on Arnold's first and second volumes, *The Strayed Reveller, and Other Poems* (1849) and *Empedocles on Etna, and Other Poems* (1852). Smart described the first volume as "exceedingly scarce; it was withdrawn from circulation before many copies were sold"; the second, as "very scarce. It was withdrawn from circulation before fifty copies were sold" (p. 2). Smart recorded that five hundred copies each of the first and second volumes were printed. No comment upon the scarcity or the number of copies printed was made concerning the third volume.[1] It has been assumed, however, that the edition was a plentiful one.[2] Nevertheless, this volume appears to be rarer today than the "extremely scarce" *Strayed Reveller* and the "very scarce" *Empedocles*. There is an adequate explanation for the rarity. *Poems*, at the time of publication, was not considered to be a volume of any distinction. It was advertised as "a new edition"; in fact, the very phrase appeared on the title page of the volume. And readers, for the most part, supposed it to be a collection of previously published poems only. Consequently, the volume has neither been emphasized by bibliographers nor valued by collectors.

Yet *Poems* has several characteristics which distinguish it as important Arnoldiana. It was the first of Arnold's volumes to bear his name; the first and second volumes were published under the quasi-anonymous initial "A." In this volume Arnold published his first work of criticism, the significant "Preface of 1853." The collection included nine new poems, among them "Sohrab and Rustum," "The Scholar Gipsy," and "The Church of Brou." Finally, thirteen of the previously published poems had been altered or had undergone revision for this publication.

The following census of *Poems* is the result of notes of enquiry published in journals, a circularization of bookdealers, a search through sales catalogues, and

[1] With the third volume Arnold changed publishers—from Benjamin Fellowes to Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. Longman's publishing records for 1853 were destroyed by enemy action during World War II.

[2] In his unpublished notebooks in the Tinker Collection of the Yale University Library, Matthew Arnold has recorded having sent out at least twenty-seven volumes of *Poems* as presentation copies and thirty-seven volumes for periodical reviewing. The large number sent out suggests an edition at least the size of the first and second volumes.

a survey made of Arnold's works in the libraries of many countries. There is no presumption, however, that this census is complete.[3]

Poems (1853)

1. Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand. Uninscribed.
2. Bodleian Library. Uninscribed.
3. British Museum. Uninscribed.
4. Roger L. Brooks. Uninscribed.
5. University of California. Stamped: "Presented by the Publishers."
6. Cambridge University. Uninscribed.
7. University of Chicago. Inscribed: "Augustine Birrell."
8. Norman Colbeck. Two copies. Uninscribed.
9. Colby College. Uninscribed.
10. Cornell University. Uninscribed.
11. Eton College. Uninscribed.
12. Harvard University. Uninscribed.
13. John Hayward. Uninscribed.
14. Honnold Library. Uninscribed.
15. Henry E. Huntington Library. Uninscribed.
16. University of Illinois. Inscribed: "L.A."
17. Indiana University. Inscribed: "E. P. Arnold, from M. Arnold."
18. King's College, Newcastle-on-Tyne. Inscribed: "C. J. B. from M. C. Hill Feb. 13, 1854."
19. Library of Congress. Uninscribed.
20. Liverpool University. Uninscribed.
21. London Library. Uninscribed.
22. Robert Liddel Lowe. Inscribed: "E. S. Sanderson C.C.C.C."
23. McGill University, Montreal. Uninscribed.
24. J. C. Maxwell. Inscribed: "Mortimer Collins."
25. University of Michigan. Uninscribed.
26. National Library of India, Calcutta. Uninscribed.
27. National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh. Uninscribed.
28. Newberry Library. Inscribed: "F. Antrobus, Jan. 1854, Eton Col."
29. Oriel College, Oxford. Uninscribed.
30. Princeton University. Inscribed: "George Dennison, Feby 19th 1854."
31. Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. Inscribed: "Dingles 133."
32. Gordon N. Ray. Two copies. One copy inscribed: "From the Author" "J. D. Coleridge from M. Arnold 1853." The other copy stamped: "Presented by the Publishers."
33. University of Rochester. Inscribed: "Chas. W. Lyon, Silver Hill."

[3] I am presently engaged in a bibliographical survey and study of the extant copies of *The Strayed Reveller, and Other Poems, Empedocles on Etna, and Other Poems*, and *Poems* (1853). I should appreciate having information concerning copies of these volumes.

34. Rutgers University. Uninscribed.
35. John M. Shaw. Inscribed. "E. S. P. from H. P. Feb. 2, 1859."
36. Robert H. Taylor. Stamped: "Presented by the Publishers."
37. University of Texas. Inscribed: "To Jemima K. Quillinan and Rotha Quillinan with M. Arnold's kindest regards. November. 1853."
38. Chauncey B. Tinker. Inscribed: "Fras. C. Lawley to Stephen W. Lawley, November, 1853."
39. Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland. Uninscribed.
40. Victoria & Albert Museum. Uninscribed.
41. University of Virginia. Inscribed: "Wm Gaskell" "From the Author."
42. Wellesley College. Uninscribed.
43. Arnold Whitridge. An inscribed copy to a member of the Arnold family.
44. Williams College. Uninscribed.
45. Dr. Williams's Library, London. Uninscribed.
46. Yale University. Uninscribed.

ROGER L. BROOKS

Texas Technological College, Lubbock

The War Memorial at Sudbury, Ontario

An arresting comment on the last four lines of A. E. Housman's 32nd lyric of *Last Poems* ("When I would muse in boyhood") came to my notice in an unpublished manuscript (pages 27-28) by Mark Holstein catalogued in the New York Public Library:

"It appears that Sudbury, Ontario, was offered an original quatrain by Rudyard Kipling for inscription on the city's war memorial. The selection committee turned it down in favour of a quatrain by a local poet, which ran as follows:

> They buckled their belts about them,
> In ships they crossed the sea;
> They fought and found six feet of ground,
> And died for you and me.

"The selectors were criticized," Holstein goes on with mock solemnity, "for preferring the work of a nonentity to that of Kipling, but the criticism was not wholly just, for the four lines accepted as the work of the local poet are scarcely an improvement on the last stanza [read *four lines*] of Housman's poem." These are the lines:

> They braced their belts about them,
> They crossed in ships the sea,
> They sought and found six feet of ground,
> And there they died for me.

Was Housman's mutilated quatrain actually engraved on the monument? Holstein seems to imply it was. I took the question to His Worship, J. J. Fabro, of the City of Sudbury, who graciously enclosed in his reply the epitaphic lines:

WE, GIVING ALL, GAINED ALL. NEITHER LAMENT US
NOR PRAISE. ONLY IN ALL THINGS RECALL—
IT IS FEAR NOT DEATH THAT SLAYS.

The three lines appear below a wreathed sword on two opposite sides of the base of the white marble shaft. Another side bears a French translation. My correspondent also included a letter received by a former Mayor of Sudbury from the poet:

India,
April 17, 1928.

Dear Mr. Ferry:

Yours of the 28th of March has come on to me here where I am staying for a while.

I enclose herewith the verse that I have made for your Memorial in Sudbury and I only wish that it were better. It is not easy work to do.

Please let your committee know that if this does not suit them they need not feel the least scruples about throwing it out. I shall quite understand.

Very sincerely yours,
Rudyard Kipling.

The man who saved the day by exposing the imposture and cleared the way for the acceptance of Kipling's poem was E. W. Harrold, assistant editor of *The Ottawa Citizen* and for fifteen years writer of the column, "The Diary of Our Own Pepys."[1] In his entry for 31 Dec. 1936 he records his surprise at the rejection and his feeling that the "local poet's" contribution has a persistently familiar ring. Consultation with a librarian soon traced the garbled lines to their source.

Kipling's poem may now be found under the caption "Epitaphs of the War (1914-1918)" in the volume *The Years Between* (page 409), forming part of the comprehensive edition of his Collected Works, published in 1941 by Doubleday & Doran, Inc., of New York. There it appears properly as a quatrain with (it may be presumed) the author's punctuation:

We, giving all, gained all.
Neither lament us nor praise;
Only, in all things recall,
It is fear, not death, that slays.

[1] See *The Diary of Our Own Pepys—E. W. Harrold's Record of Canadian Life*, ed. by I. Norman Smith (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1947) pp. 80-81.

This has the authentic Kipling flavor, and T. S. Eliot thought well enough of the poem to include it in his *A Choice of Kipling's Verse* (London: Faber & Faber, 1941, p. 163); and it is by this medium that the lines have become generally known to English readers. In 1949 Eliot's anthology, translated by Jules Castier, was published by Laffont, of Paris. This increase of the accessibility of the memorial stanza, rescued from the out-of-the-way location of the inscription, not to mention the obscurity of a 28-volume set, has endowed it with a new, perhaps a disproportionate, significance. However that may be, Kipling's humbly offered verse has attained two different kinds of imperishability, as we rate such things, and is a standing example of the narrow margins of chance in the doings of literary persons.

And what of the local poet? It seems he must be left in the obscurity from which he came so painfully near emerging. From Sudbury town no further information on him is available.

Tom Burns Haber

The Ohio State University

A Checklist of A. E. Housman's Writings in Latin

Despite A. E. Housman's eminence as a Latin scholar, he told his colleague at Trinity College, Cambridge, Dr. A. S. F. Gow, that he himself had little taste for writing in the language. Thus during a lifetime devoted to the study of classical literature he wrote only two poems in Latin—a translation from Dryden (1) and a dedication of his edition of Manilius to Moses J. Jackson (3) —but on ten other occasions he yielded to requests and composed Latin pieces in prose. Eight of these I published in *The Classical Journal* a few years ago (4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12); the ninth was reprinted more recently in a note in *PBSA* (2); and it was made known just last year in *The Times Literary Supplement* that Housman wrote a tenth one, a dedication of Hopkins' poems (6).

For an A.E.H. bibliography, on which I have been working for a number of years, I should like to learn of any other poetry or prose in Latin from his pen. Details of the twelve known Latin compositions by the author of *A Shropshire Lad* are given in the chronological checklist below:

1. "Hendecasyllables." *The Bromsgrovian* I (25 May 1882), 92. [A translation of John Dryden's poem, "Britain," from *King Arthur*. Reprinted in *The Classical Journal* L (Jan. 1955), 160; and in John Carter and Joseph W. Scott, *A. E. Housman: Catalogue of an Exhibition on the Centenary of His Birth* (London: University College, 1959) pp. 22-23.]
2. Sydney Address. *Record of the Jubilee Celebrations of the University of Sydney*.

September 30th. 1902 (Sydney: William Brooks and Co., Limited, 1903) p. 144. [Greetings from University College London, signed Reay, Collegii Praeses. Reprinted in *PBSA* LII (Second Quarter 1958), 138-39. A. S. F. Gow, *A. E. Housman: A Sketch* (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936) p. 80 n., ascribes the work to Housman.]

3. Manilius Dedication. "Sodali Meo M. I. Iackson Harum Litterarum Contemptori," M. Manilii, *Astronomicon,* Liber Primus, Recensuit et Enarravit A. E. Housman (Londinii: Apud Grant Richards, MDCCCCIII) p. v. [Reprinted in Editio Altera (Cantabrigiae: Typis Academiae, MDCCCCXXXVII) p. iii; and in Grant Richards, *Housman: 1897-1936* (London: Oxford University Press, 1941; New York: Oxford University Press, 1942) pp. 441-43, with Edmund Wilson's translation, "Dedication to a Book," from *The Bookman* (New York) LXVI (Oct. 1927), 162.]
4. Flaxman Inscription. For a collection of casts by John Flaxman (1755-1826), given to University College London by Maria Denman; in stone on the wall of the Flaxman Gallery; done during Housman's term at University College London between 1892 and 1911. [Printed in *The Classical Journal* L (Jan. 1955), 164; and in *The Times Literary Supplement,* 16 Oct. 1959, p. 593.]
5. Kyteless Inscription. For the foundation stone of the Kyteless block of classrooms at Bromsgrove School; the block was dedicated in June 1913, but the inscription was composed later; the block was opened in June 1914. [Printed in H. E. M. Icely, *Bromsgrove School Through Four Centuries* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953), p. 119; and in *The Classical Journal* L (Jan. 1955), 165.]
6. Hopkins Dedication. "CATHARINAE | HVNC LIBRVM | QVI FILII EIVS CARISSIMI | POETAE DEBITAM INGENIO LAVDEM EXPECTANTIS | SERVM TAMEN MONVMENTVM ESSET | ANNVM AETATIS XCVIII AGENTI | VETERIS AMICITIAE PIGNVS | DDD | RB | ," *Poems* of Gerard Manley Hopkins, Edited with notes by Robert Bridges (London: Oxford University Press, 1918). [Dedication to Hopkins' mother, reprinted in later editions, Second, 1930, p. xix; Third (First American), 1948, p. 3. See Simon Nowell-Smith, "Housman Inscriptions," *The Times Literary Supplement,* 6 Nov. 1959, p. 643.]
7. Butler Memorial Inscription. For a memorial brass in the Trinity College, Cambridge, Chapel for Henry Montagu Butler (1833-1918). [Printed in J. R. M. Butler, *Henry Montagu Butler: Master of Trinity College Cambridge 1886-1918: A Memoir by His Son* (London [etc.]: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925) p. 228; in G. M. Trevelyan, *Trinity College: An Historical Sketch* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1943) p. 113; and in *The Classical Journal* L (Jan. 1955), 161.]
8. Prior Memorial Inscription. For a memorial brass in the Trinity College, Cambridge, Chapel for Joseph Prior (1834-1918). [Printed in *The Classical Journal* L (Jan. 1955), 161. A. S. F. Gow, *A. E. Housman: A Sketch,* p. 32n., ascribes the inscription for Prior and the next four to Housman.]

9. Taylor Memorial Inscription. For a memorial brass in the Trinity College, Cambridge, Chapel for Henry Martyn Taylor (1842-1927). [Printed in *The Classical Journal* L (Jan. 1955), 162.]
10. Glaisher Memorial Inscription. For a memorial brass in the Trinity College, Cambridge, Chapel for James Whitbread Lee Glaisher (1848-1928). [Printed in *The Classical Journal* L (Jan. 1955), 163.]
11. Scott Burmese Collection Inscription. For a plate on a case containing books about Burma, given to the University Library, Cambridge, by Sir Robert Forsyth Scott (1849-1933). [Printed in *The Classical Journal* L (Jan. 1955), 165.]
12. Laurence Memorial Inscription. For a memorial brass in the Trinity College, Cambridge, Chapel for Reginald Vere Laurence (1876-1934). [Printed in *The Classical Journal* L (Jan. 1955), 163.]

William White

Wayne State University

News and Notes

Presidential election years bring out presidential exhibitions. Campaign buttons and badges are perennial exhibition favorites, but a good display of letters of the presidents deserves a place on library exhibition schedules in years that the choice is made. This year the University of Kentucky Library presented in July and August, "Presidents and Near-Presidents," a selection of letters and documents from the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Philip D. Sang of River Forest, Illinois. An illustrated catalogue compiled by S. B. Gribble is available. Included are descriptions of such fine items as the earliest extant letter of Washington, one of the two known letters signed by William Henry Harrison as president, Henry Clay's letter on the "conduct befitting a candidate for the Presidency of the United States," Stephen A. Douglas's last surviving letter, and a rough map of the San Francisco Bay area in the hand of Herbert C. Hoover which identifies Alcatraz as "Al Capone's Residence." A catalogue has also been issued of selections from the Lincolniana collection of Justin G. Turner which were on display at the San Francisco Public Library earlier this year. In October and early November, the Pierpont Morgan Library will have an exhibition of autograph letters of the presidents.

❁ ❁ ❁

Dr. Emmet F. Horine, distinguished historian of medicine in the Ohio Valley, has presented his important Charles Caldwell collection to the University of Louisville Medical Library. The fruit of four decades, the collection is virtually complete, and it includes ancillary material on phrenology and hypnotism. In order to make the material more accessible to future scholars, Dr. Horine has written a *Biographical Sketch and Guide to the Writings of Charles Caldwell, M.D. (1772-1853)* (Brooks, Kentucky, High Acres Press, 1960; 155 pp.), a detailed bio-bibliographical study.

❁ ❁ ❁

The scholarly world learned with real sorrow and some measure of surprise that the *Harvard Library Bulletin* will stop publication with the Autumn 1960 number. Coming at a time when Harvard has been most generously enriched by her friends and well-wishers, the decision is difficult to understand.

The *Bulletin* has been the best in its field since it began publication in 1947, and its death will leave a serious gap in the ranks of American scholarly journals. We may hope that some of the manuscripts it might have published will be submitted to *PBSA*; but it will not be the same thing, for G. William Cottrell's editorial touch will be lacking. He will be greatly missed from his chair, but it

is reassuring to know that he will continue his association with his *alma mater* —few men in recent years have served her so loyally and so well. We wish him success and happiness in his new undertakings, hail him for his contributions to bibliographical studies, and regret his retirement from active editing. May the total eclipse of the journal he conducted with such brilliance be of short duration; the light from its corona is still strong enough to read by!—R. F. M.

❀ ❀ ❀

Douglas Grant, professor of English in the University of Toronto, editor of *The University of Toronto Quarterly*, and author and editor of a number of volumes in the field of English literature, has recently been appointed to the new Chair of American Literature in the University of Leeds. The Chair is the first of its kind in the United Kingdom. The intention is to build up a center for the graduate study of American literature, although this will be done under a considerable handicap until there is an adequate collection of books on the subject, especially of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Professor Grant hopes that the idea of helping to form such a collection may appeal to American bibliophiles who like to see their country's contribution to literature appreciated abroad; "News and Notes" will be happy to supply further details.

❀ ❀ ❀

The schedule of The Grolier Club of New York for the coming season includes (tentatively at this writing) exhibitions devoted to the history of espionage, the Lewis and Clark papers recently acquired by The Yale University Library, the three hundredth anniversary of the Restoration of the English monarchy under King Charles II, and *imagerie populaire*. Beginning in mid-December, the Club will present an exhibition of books, manuscripts, and even a few kitchen utensils, illustrating the history of gastronomy. Cook books are widely collected and much appreciated by those who own them, but the landmarks in the field are usually difficult to find in good condition; the Club hopes to bring together as many of them as possible from all parts of the world.

❀ ❀ ❀

Visitors to United States libraries this fall will include David Foxon of the British Museum staff and Cecil Price of University College, Aberystwyth. Mr. Foxon, who spent last year visiting Harvard, The Folger Shakespeare Library, Texas, Illinois, and the Huntington Library, will be at Yale during the fall term. Mr. Price will hold a fellowship at the Folger during the autumn and winter.

❀ ❀ ❀

La Casa del Libro at Calle del Cristo 255, San Juan, Puerto Rico, was opened to the public just over two years ago. It is part museum, part workshop, and its single-minded purpose is to raise the standards of printing in the Commonwealth by making examples of fine printing available and by assembling materials on the Hispanic-American cultural heritage. Dr. Elmer Adler, founder and director, retired in 1952 as director of the Graphic Arts Collection at the Princeton University Library, a post which came naturally to him after many active years as organizer and typographer of Pynson Printers of New York and as an editor of *The Colophon*. As an apostle of good taste and a bit of a perfectionist, he has, in these two short years introduced to and established in Puerto Rico an appreciation of fine printing.

The library of nearly 4,000 volumes is housed in a restored eighteenth-century building of great charm on a narrow street in old San Juan. It has been assembled with the aid of the Puerto Rican government, the *amigos* (of which more later), and Dr. Adler himself to illustrate the history of the written and printed word and to show to the people of Puerto Rico and the world the story of the great Hispanic-American heritage of which the island is so justly proud. Two hundred examples of fifteenth-century printing form the most distinguished single group within the library and the jewels within this setting are some forty examples of Spanish incunabula—the largest collection of its kind in Latin America. Several of these Spanish items are unique and others are the only copies to be found in North America. Among the manuscripts, which range from the twelfth century to modern calligraphy, two *cédulas* (government decrees) dated in 1493 are probably the most important and certainly make the greatest appeal to the imagination. Signed by King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella, they provide for wheat to provision the fleet of Christopher Columbus on his second voyage. It was on this trip that Columbus discovered Puerto Rico and named it San Juan.

Puerto Rico, a prosperous and cosmopolitan commonwealth, is truly a crossroads of Anglo-Saxon and Spanish culture. Visitors have come to La Casa del Libro from all over the world. (This editor arrived almost simultaneously with a group from Viet Nam.) Many of these visitors join the friends of the library, the *Amigos de Calle del Cristo 255*. Their gifts are used entirely for the purchase of significant items for the library and their gifts in kind show a keen awareness of the nature of the library's functions. Dr. Adler, who came to Puerto Rico in 1955 and decided to make it his home, cordially invites BSA members and their friends to visit at Calle del Cristo 255 when they are in San Juan and invites correspondence from all who share his ideals and can help with his well-laid plans to make this unique institution a greater force in the world of printing and graphic arts and in the cultural development of Puerto Rico.

Book Reviews

BERGHMAN, ARVID. *Ex Libris, En bok om bokägarmärken.* Malmö: Allhems Förlag, 1957. 179 pp. Sw. Kr. 42.

The author of this work is one of Sweden's foremost authorities on the ex libris: He is a founder and honorary member of the Swedish Ex Libris Society, and for many years has been a bookplate collector and designer; he is the author of a number of volumes on heraldry, orders, and decorations.

Berghman's special competence as a student of heraldry has well fitted him to write this excellent work on the art of the ex libris which, of course, is closely related to the heraldic art. He believes that the modern design of ex libris, which shows some tendencies toward formlessness, dilettantism, and pseudo-artistic qualities, could profit by renewing its association with heraldry and its discipline, restraint, and genuine pictorial content, and he emphasizes that the design of the ex libris places special technical and artistic demands on those who would practice the art—a *Kleinkunst* with old and honorable traditions, reflecting in special ways the styles and levels of taste of the periods represented.

There is an informative introduction dealing with the nature of the ex libris and the various types of ownership devices which have been used, such as the superexlibris, the hand-painted ex libris, and the armorial binding. This is followed by a general history of ex libris and a special chapter on its development in the Scandinavian countries. The author identifies and discusses in another chapter the different categories of ex libris, among which he includes the monogram, heraldic, portrait, donation, topographic, symbolic, allegorical, and the professional book plate. Further chapters provide a general orientation in heraldry, emblems, and traditional symbols. Two short but useful sections at the end of the book deal with the collecting of book plates and their preservation, and the practical matters of making a personal ex libris.

The work is attractively illustrated with some 350 reproductions (many in color) of plates mentioned in the text. There are detailed notes, an extensive bibliography arranged partly by country and partly by subject, and an index. A list of the principal ex libris societies is also included.

This is a handsomely produced volume typical of the fine work done by Allhems Förlag in Malmö. The typography is clean and fresh. A difficult problem of layout—the arrangement of hundreds of book plates of varying size without crowding or without unnecessarily generous margins—has been solved with discretion, most of the plates having been reproduced, with good balance, on unobtrusively tinted pages.

Even those who have little knowledge of Swedish will find this handsome volume valuable for its many illustrations, its bibliography, and as an example of the high standard of Swedish book production.

Thomas R. Buckman

University of Kansas

Bühler, Curt F. *The University and the Press in Fifteenth-Century Bologna.* Notre Dame, Ind.: Mediaeval Institute, University of Notre Dame, 1958. 109 pp., 1 plate. (Text and Studies in the History of Mediaeval Education, no. 7.)

The first country outside the boundaries of Germany to which Gutenberg's revolutionary invention spread was Italy, where its development was rapid and unequaled by any other country. By the turn of the year 1470-71 the art of printing was introduced in Bologna, one of the oldest University towns in Europe and the foremost seat of legal scholarship. The first printing office was established under the protection of the University by three men, of whom Balthasar Azoguidus was the driving force. Other professional printers soon followed, and by the turn of the century 47 different printing establishments had been working during a longer or shorter period of time in this city. In 1500, four relatively productive presses were still at work.

Curt F. Bühler, keeper of printed books at the Pierpont Morgan Library, has now published a scholarly and well-documented investigation of printing in fifteenth-century Bologna. His work is a splendid example of how a very dry list of books produced in a given area can be made to yield much valuable information, in the hands of a competent scholar.

Naturally, the intellectual life of Bologna was dominated by the University. The Faculty of Law enjoyed a great renown throughout Europe, and famous humanists were associated with the Faculty of Arts. Nevertheless only a few of the university teachers are found to be authors of books printed in Bologna between 1470 and 1500, or on the whole, of any printed books. For educational purposes the books of older authorities were used. Bühler points out astonishing examples of what was not printed in Bologna during the fifteenth century. One very often finds a long list of works which during this time were bound to be included in the production of almost any printing office—primarily the classical authors. Humanistic studies were flourishing, especially in Italy. More than 160 incunabula editions of Virgil were published, but none of them were printed in Bologna. In this city no books were printed in the Greek language, in spite of the fact that one of the printers of the town, Dionysius Bertochus, printed Greek books both before and after his stay in Bologna. Even Dante could not tempt the

printers of the capital of Emilia. The church's demand for literature was remarkably ignored by the printers of Bologna. Hundreds of editions of Bibles, missals, graduales, breviaries, psalters, and other books of ecclesiastical usage emanated from the presses in the fifteenth century, but none of them was printed in Bologna. Books lucrative from a mercantile point of view, such as editions of St. Augustine, St. Bernard, and Jacobus de Voragine, were not printed in Bologna either. Bühler also accounts for equally astonishing results insofar as legal literature is concerned. Of the numerous incunabula editions of *Corpus juris civilis* and *Corpus juris canonici*, not a single one was printed in this well-established center of legal studies. Of the approximately 200 editions of Bartolus de Saxoferrato's legal works, only one was published in Bologna. Among the great names of medicine and surgery in the Middle Ages, authors such as Mesue, Rhasis, Pietro d'Abano, and Guilielmus de Saliceto are not to be found in the production of the Bologna printers. One edition of Mondino's famous anatomical text-book was, however, published here in 1482, in the author's native town. Neither the works of Pliny nor any Aristotelian scientific text were printed in Bologna.

Since over 500 incunabula were published in Bologna one has reason to wonder, as did Bühler, what kind of books the printers considered a profitable investment for printing. The publishers, of course, had a stock of the previously mentioned current books which were not printed locally, but were supplied by the presses in other cities, primarily Venice, Milan, Padua, and Pavia. Bühler's statistics on the production of the presses in Bologna show that somewhat more than a fourth (136 titles, to be specific) were law books. Next came natural science and humanistic literature. Theological literature accounted for only seven per cent of the total. Such a low number can be explained by the fact that the school of theology was not founded at the university until 1507. Of the 117 scientific works, one-third was composed of the very popular prognostica. According to the university's regulations, a lecturer in astronomy had to supply a prognostication each year. Apart from these insignificant calendars, a considerable number of *editiones principes* written by scientists appeared in Bologna. Bologna also has the honor of having been the place where the first illustrated edition of Ptolemy's *Geography* (1477) was printed.

Bühler also presents a statistical report including the 225 authors of the Bologna incunables, and from this one can deduce that 143 of them were active during the fifteenth century. The most productive of these authors were members of the university at this time. Philippus Beroaldus, the humanist, is represented by nineteen editions of his works. The same number can be accredited to Girolamo Manfredi, but most of his work consists of prognostica. It is true that they are rare publications, but hardly of abiding scientific value. Among the

lawyers, Ludovico Bolognini, Alessandro Tartagni, and Andrea Barbatia are especially noted. All three were teachers at the university, and each one is represented by fifteen works. Among the classical authors Cicero is the most outstanding, with nine works, a few of the lesser ones in *editiones principes*.

Of the 47 printing presses in fifteenth-century Bologna, no less than 24 discontinued their production after producing only one or two works. Among them were two Hebrew printers. Over half of Bologna's incunables were issued by five printers: Ugo Rugerius (79), Franciscus Plato de Benedictis (69), Benedictus Hectoris (61), Balthasar Azoguidus (30), and Henricus de Colonia (29). Rugerius was in business longer than any of the others (21 years), and Benedictis came next (11 years). In terms of productivity, Hectoris is at the head of the group with 61 books in seven years.

Bühler concludes his book with a chronological list of all the printing offices and their production with reference to the main catalogues of incunabula, such as GW, Hain, BMC, Stillwell, etc. There is also a diagram showing the dates of the various printers' activity.

These notes are but a few excerpts from the wealth of information that Bühler has deducted from his material. The book offers a great deal not only to the historian of printing, but also to the student of the rich intellectual life of the late Middle Ages. Bibliographers and historians alike owe a debt of gratitude to the author for a brilliant example of his outstanding scholarship.

Hans Sallander

University of Uppsala Library

Bühler, Curt F. *William Caxton and His Critics*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1960. viii, 30 pp. $2.50.

This is a Brewster House Book, charmingly designed and printed, which presents one of the contributions of one of England's great printers, William Caxton.

Dr. Bühler, keeper of printed books at the Pierpont Morgan Library, which has a magnificent collection of Caxtons, in a succinct and most readable presentation, reviews the known facts about Caxton and reappraises his contribution to the enrichment of the English language.

In the fifteenth century modern English was still emerging. Largely through the efforts of Caxton and his colleagues Wynkyn de Worde and Richard Pynson, English spelling was fixed. One English scholar has gone so far as to say that Caxton "did more than any other man before or since to establish the English language." I would not disagree.

The book contains a facsimile of the *Boke of Eneydos*, 1490 (a popular version

of Virgil's *Aeneid*). This is followed by Dr. Bühler's rendition of Caxton's Prologue into current English. Caxton's little book, here presented, "shows the man in an ever-new and ever-appealing manner."

As Dr. Bühler writes, "Wherever English is spoken, the name of William Caxton will always be cherished as a sturdy and puissant champion of vernacular prose." All lovers of fine printing, the history of printing, and the development of the English language will enjoy this little book.

HERBERT F. WEST

Dartmouth College

EDELSTEIN, J. M., comp. *A Bibliographic Checklist of the Writings of Thornton Wilder.* New Haven: Yale University Library, 1959. 62 pp. $2.50.

This well-organized and scholarly compilation is the first published bibliography of the works of Thornton Niven Wilder, and will be welcomed by students of American literature.

The checklist is confined to four categories: first appearance of books and pamphlets by Wilder (fifteen of these are listed), contributions to other volumes (thirty-seven listed), first periodical publications (eighty-seven listed), and miscellaneous publications (six listed). Within these limitations, the coverage is complete; but later printings—as, for example, the fine *Thornton Wilder Trio*, with Malcolm Cowley's introduction—and the translations into Italian, German, French, Japanese, and Russian are omitted. The inclusion of *The Stories*, a 1934 one-volume collection of *The Bridge of San Luis Rey*, *The Cabala*, and *The Woman of Andros*, seems to be the one violation of the criteria which Edelstein has set for himself. Another apparent exception is the inclusion of *Three Plays*, 1957; however, *The Skin of Our Teeth* is the only one of this trio that is actually a reprint— *Our Town* is slightly revised, and *The Matchmaker* (a complete rewriting of the earlier, 1939, play *The Merchant of Yonkers*) appears here in its entirety for the first time. "Tribute to Lawrenceville" is listed twice, with a cross-reference—originally as an article in *Town and Country* magazine, and also as a part of the book *History of the Lawrenceville School.* Similar treatment is accorded "The Happy Journey to Camden and Trenton" and "Kultur in einer Demokratie," both of which were republished in anthologies (no cross-references are given here). "James Joyce" is listed both as an essay in *Poetry* magazine, where it first appeared in 1941, and as a separate publication in 1944. Though no translations are listed, Wilder's writings in foreign languages are included, *e.g.*, "Kultur in einer Demokratie" and "Brief an Rudolph Hirsch"; and both the English and French simultaneous publications of *The Artist in Modern Society (L'Artiste dans la Société Contemporaine)* are listed.

The bibliographical information is accurate and meticulously detailed, even to the point of indicating the color of most of the original dust wrappers. Useful notes are incorporated into a number of the entries, *e.g.*, for every play, the place and date of the first performance are given; and for books and pamphlets the exact day of publication is supplied, as well as the number of copies printed in the first edition. Notes state that *Heaven's My Destination* was selected by both the Book-of-the-Month Club and the English Book Society, and that *The Ides of March* was a Book-of-the-Month Club selection; no mention is made of the fact that *The Bridge of San Luis Rey, The Skin of Our Teeth,* and *Our Town* received Pulitzer Awards.

The type is, in general, clear and easily readable, but a number of pages are marred by failure of some of the letters to print properly; and the composition is poor in several places. The format of the book is undistinguished, and the binder's title on the backstrip is somewhat misleading. There is a very good index.

Errors noted include: A2c, "Foundry" is spelled "Foundrey"; A3a, "Proserpina" is spelled "Prosperpina," and in the index, page 61, "Prospina" is used; also in A3a, the capitalization of "And the Sea shall Give Up its Dead" does not agree with the contents page and running head of the volume itself—the correct form is used in C36; A5b (and throughout) the spelling "glacine" is used, whereas Webster's *New International Dictionary* (2nd edition, unabridged) gives "glassine"; A7b, a period, not a comma, should follow Rushmore's name; A 11, "red" is spelled "read"; B6, translator's name is "Miles," not "Hiles"; B7a page reference should be "pp. 33-37," not "p. 37"; B19, reference to C54 is lacking; B20, "[sic]" is spelled "[six]"; B28, the title reads "EN" instead of "AN"; C14, the date should be 1918, not 1919; C20, the volume number should be LXXXIV, not LXXIV; C21 and C22, the page references have been interchanged; C41, the word "Note" is omitted; "Romance Philology" is spelled "Romance Philogy" in the index, p. 61.

EUGENE P. WATSON

Northwestern State College of Louisiana

FUNKE, FRITZ. *Buchkunde; ein Ueberblick ueber die Geschichte des Buch- und Schriftwesens.* Leipzig: VEB Otto Harrassowitz, 1959. (Lehrbuecher fuer den Nachwuchs an wissenschaftlichen Bibliotheken Band 3)

It is a pleasure indeed to review an author who states his intentions clearly in his preface and does not deviate from his purpose. Funke wanted to write a textbook of the vast field of knowledge connected with the book and give the

serious student a first introduction into this subject matter and the various research problems connected with it. There is no doubt that the author has succeeded in achieving his aim and has given an excellent tool both to teachers and students.

Funke has organized his material into three broad groups. The first part is devoted to the hand-produced book. The individual chapters deal with the history of the script, writing material, scribes, physical forms of manuscripts, and illumination. The second part sketches the history of the printed book. The subdivisions narrate the invention of printing, development of the German printing press from the Renaissance up to 1800, modern printing machinery, and modern book art (up to 1930). The third part is somewhat incongruous and must be called "Varia." The first chapter deals with typography and calligraphy, then follow sections on modern paper manufacturing, illustration of the printed book, and book binding.

It is very difficult to arrange systematically a broad and almost boundless field of learning, and deviations of opinion with regard to organization do not carry qualitative connotations; but Funke, it seems to me, has made his task unnecessarily hard by forcing the entire subject into the Procrustean bed of a tripartite division. This results not only in overlapping and slight repetition, but also dispersion of intimately related facts. For instance the history of paper is discussed in part 1 (pp. 38-39), but watermarks are explained in part 3 in an appendix to the chapter on modern paper manufacturing (p. 215).

The history of script from its origins to the humanistic cursive of the sixteenth century is outlined in part 1 (pp. 15-35), but late gothic and Renaissance German calligraphy appears as an appendix to the chapter on typography (p. 207). Funke has, of course, fully realized that history of printing, typography, and book illustration are intimately connected, especially in the incunabula period (pp. 73-99, 181-85, 217-30); but his substitutes, cross-references and index, do not compensate for the lack of a coherent description.

The author has worked carefully and has full command of the literature of the field, but a few incorrect statements are bound to occur in such a book. Papyrus was not used in the *high* middle ages and surely not for codices. Parchment was used for occidental manuscripts almost exclusively from about 500 on; the older writing material still lingered on in royal and papal chancelleries. As papyrus export from Egypt stopped in 693, parchment was substituted for the Merovingian documents and finally in the papal curia under Benedict IX (1032). The palaeographical chapter suffers from over-simplification; the frequent use of the adjective "unmistakably" in the description of scripts is misleading for the beginner.

The first printed title page is not Dupré, 1481 (p. 97), but Erhard Ratdolt,

Venice, 1476. Simple title pages had already appeared in *Sermo predicabilis*, Cologne, Therhoernen, 1470, and *Tractatulus compendiosus*, Esslingen, Fyner, 1473. The lack of a publisher's binding is not confined to the incunabula period (p. 98), but is characteristic of European book production till late in the eighteenth century.

The description of the manuscript trade in old Rome (p. 43) assumes, erroneously I believe, that the methods of production which are mirrored in the price edict of the emperor Diocletian are representative of all antiquity.

It is understandable that Funke had to use great discrimination in selecting his bibliographical apparatus, but a few outstanding titles should not have been omitted. For the history of writing material in the Middle Ages Leo Santifaller, *Beitraege zur Geschichte der Beschreibstoffe im Mittelalter*, Graz, 1953, is of fundamental importance. No discussion of typography can overlook: Charles Enchedé, *Fonderies dans les Pays Bas*, Haarlem, 1908; Talbot Reed, *History of the Old English Letter Foundries*, London, 1952; and Daniel Updike, *Printing Types*, 2nd edition, Cambridge, 1937. A modern description of watermarks cannot stop with Briquet but should quote the *Monumenta chartae papyraceae historiam illustrantia*, Hilversum, Paper Publication Society, 1951 ff. Even a short list of books on binding should include: Ernst Ph. Goldschmidt, *Gothic and Renaissance Bookbindings*, London, 1928, and Ernst Kyriss, *Verzierte gothische Einbaende*, Stuttgart, 1951-58.

The book is well written, excellently printed, and meets all the standards we are accustomed to expect from German scholarly publications.

Felix Reichmann

Cornell University Library

Fugger, Wolfgang. *Schreibbüchlein "Ein nutzlich und wolgegrundt Formular manncherley schöner Schriefften."* Vollständige Faksimile-Ausgabe des 1553 in Nürnberg erschienenen Werkes. Intro. Fritz Funke. Institut für Buchgestaltung an der Hochschule für Grafik und Buchkunst. Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1958. xviii, 207 pp. collotype plates. $6.50.

Calligraphy's "restauration," made manifest by Edward Johnston's turn-of-the-century teaching in British art schools, began its documentation in 1926 with Stanley Morison's facsimile of our first writing manual, Ludovico degli Arrighi's *Operina* (Roma, 1522). Morison's introductory essay on Arrighi's script remains the most perceptive and discriminating single judgment our century has given us on any writing master, and it is still acclaimed for its inspiring character by a steadily growing professional and lay readership. Since

then the *Operina* alone has had two facsimile editions in America and one in Sweden; and several other Italian manuals (by Pacioli, Verini, Tagliente, and Palatino) have similarly appeared here in facsimile. But it remained for England to produce a German manual; in 1955 the Royal College of Art published a Fugger facsimile with his text matter replaced by an English translation to face the relevant plate pages, omitting only the original's Greek and Hebrew sections. Spurred perhaps by the British example, a German academy now gives us the first complete facsimile of Fugger's 1553 edition, to which Fritz Funke contributes an introduction exceptionally informative about the author's still enigmatic life and character. It is a most handsome and sensitive piece of bookmaking, fully worthy of its original, which, as its discursive title declares, is "A Useful and well-grounded Formulary for Divers Fair Hands."

Wolfgang Fugger, disciple and friend of Johann Neudörffer, dedicates this work to that revered master, whose own more authoritative manual had appeared in 1538. Fugger intends his book for beginners, referring all others to Neudörffer as to a supreme master, a source for graduate study, as it were. Yet at his introductory level Fugger has much to give to all aspiring scribes. He deals most securely with the Gothic hands of native usage, less capably with romans and italics, and remarkably well with Hebrew and Greek; in the last he acknowledges a due deference to Aldus Manutius of Venice. But beyond Fugger's indebtedness to other masters, his manual shows original aspects as well. A close connection with printing and publishing makes him the first to consider the needs of printers and punch cutters. He several times adds to his alphabets a showing of the ligatures and abbreviations needed in a font of printing type, and offers sharp criticism of typographical vagaries. Further, he shows the first extended treatment of musical notation in a writing manual. Finally, following earlier exemplars (Verini's *Luminario* 1527, and Dürer's *Unterweysung* 1525), Fugger shows how to construct roman capitals by geometrical means; and his resulting forms equal or surpass any contemporary endeavor in this style.

Fugger's way of teaching is that of a lover of letter forms guiding the beginner's every pen movement. He seems to stand at the student's elbow, ready with help and assurance; he reserves reproof for the self-indulgent (we have them today), who would put "self-expression" before instead of after letter mastery. In every case the sequence of pen strokes is clear, orderly, efficient: the attentive scribe cannot fail if he has any degree of manual and digital control. Fugger concludes his exposition of Germanic forms with a cry against the wilful distortion of letters—a cry still re-echoing in our day: "Whoever can write them well may at will bend them, twist them, break them on the wheel, hang them, behead them and make them walk on stilts—in short, do what he likes with them. But I leave it to you to judge what good all this will have done

to scripts thus martyred." Fugger's views on spacing are most aptly expressed. His printing practice makes him urge that a passage written in capitals must have the unit characters letter spaced, as we call it today. Or, as he put it, the capitals within a word must stand so far apart "that if one letter should topple, it would not touch its neighbor." This rule he urges upon scribe and compositor alike—and indeed he would like every compositor to have had some practice in lettering, since its discipline must sharpen an apprentice's awareness of forms, of spacing, and of layout as well, especially as both scribe and printer are in the end servants of the reader.

Altogether, then, here is a facsimile of a book popular in its own day but as useful and inspiring for ours, alike for scribe and printer, for calligraphile and typophile.

PAUL STANDARD

New York City

GRASES, PEDRO, ed. *Origenes de la imprenta en Venezuela y primicias editoriales de Caracas. Compilacion, prologo y notas.* Caracas: Edicion de "*El Nacional*, 1958. XV, 428 pp. facsims.

In the brochure of the second Exposición del Libro Venezolano in 1940, the late Manuel Segundo Sánchez published references relating to printing and to the newspaper and periodical press in Venezuela. At the same time, he suggested the desirability of collecting and printing the articles recorded, since they were widely scattered and on this account very difficult to consult. The first series of articles relating to the history of the Venezuelan newspaper and periodical press was collected by Grases and published in 1951 by the Escuela de Periodismo of the Universidad Central de Venezuela under the title *Materiales para la historia del periodismo en Venezuela durante el siglo XIX*, containing thirty-six articles from widely scattered sources, including the newspaper press.

The present volume, marking the 150th anniversary of the introduction of printing into Venezula on 24 Oct. 1808, and published by the Caracas newspaper *El Nacional* on its 15th anniversary, reproduces thirty-three widely scattered articles, and might equally be referred to as "Materiales." The array of articles, dating from 1874 to 1956, exhibits the varying states of knowledge of the problem dealt with, and needs to be read with the concise explanation in the brief prologue by Pedro Grases, who has himself made some material contributions to the field.

The first place, the literature of three reported instances of printing in Venezuela preceding the actual introduction in 1808 is presented, and the problems are analyzed.

The first instance refers to the *Descripción exacta de la provincia de Benezuela*, by Joseph Luis de Cisneros, with the imprint of Valencia, 1764, in the past described as the first work printed in Venezuela at Valencia in Carabobo State. According to the investigations of Grases, the work seems actually to have been printed at San Sebastián, Spain, by the printer of the Real Compañía Guipuzcoana de Caracas.

The next instance, referring to the report by Alexander von Humboldt, the German scientist, in 1808 of the existence in Venezuela of various small itinerant presses, seems in no way borne out by the most recent examination of the records or by any specimens attributable to any such presses.

The third instance relates to the shipboard press of Francisco de Miranda in 1806, which is shown not to have worked in Venezuela itself. Next, the beginnings of printing in Venezuela up to the time of independence in 1821, and mainly in Caracas, the capital city, are dealt with.

The first printers, Gallagher and Lamb, came from Trinidad on an American frigate at the instance of the authorities in Caracas. As government printers, they issued the weekly *Gazeta de Caracas*, beginning with 24 Oct. 1808, and continuing until the mid-year 1813. Thus among the South American countries, Venezuela seems relatively late in welcoming the introduction of printing. The first book printed in Venezuela was the *Calendario manual y guía universal de forasteros en Venezuela para el año de 1810*, executed by Gallagher and Lamb, containing the work of Andrés Bello. There are some facsimiles of specimen pages included, but without indication of the scale on which reproduced. Of the *Gaceta de Caracas*, as edited in facsimile edition by the Academia Nacional de la Historia of Caracas in 1939 in six volumes for the years 1808-1818, a few numbers could not be located for the reproduction. Of the *Calendario manual*, only two copies have been located, together making possible the complete facsimile reproduced by the Ministerio de Educación in 1952. The shifting scene of the Revolution until independence in Venezuela was a great factor against the preservation of copies of what Manual Segundo Sánchez has characterized as the "incunables venezolanos." Many of these that have been preserved seem to have been dispersed widely. Seemingly unique copies may be found outside of Venezuela in such places as London, Bogotá, Washington, Boston, and New Haven.

The appearance of the second volume of "Materiales" should bring not only renewed search for the "Venezuelan incunabula," but a start on the systematic year-by-year record of works printed in that period.

James B. Childs

Library of Congress

JENNETT, SEÁN. *Pioneers in Printing: Johann Gutenberg, William Caxton, William Caslon, John Baskerville, Alois Senefelder, Frederick Koenig, Ottmar Mergenthaler, Tolbert Lanston.* London: Routledge [1958]. xii, 196 pp., plates, illus. 25*s*.

In *Pioneers in Printing* Seán Jennett surveys some of the highlights in the history of printing through the lives of eight great contributors to the art. His main purpose is to bring life to his subjects. Moving along the treacherous ground between frequently scanty and disputed facts on the one hand, and an imaginative assumption of events on the other, Jennett achieves varying degrees of success as he relates the story of each of these great figures.

Gutenberg does not come forth as a real figure of human proportions, as the subject of a biographical account must, but remains a shadowy and enigmatic form behind his contribution to printing. Through a combination of quotations from his prologues and epilogues, and the prudent use of facts and imagination, Caxton emerges as a somewhat more substantial figure. A delightful and credible picture is presented of the fifty-four-year-old Caxton trekking from Bruges to Sluys on his way back to England. Caslon, Mr. Jennett aptly notes, would have been easier to bring alive in a book if he had been as successful a scoundrel as he was a founder.

With Baskerville we get the first strong throb of life. By describing his sense of failure as a printer and designer, and his methodical and determined approach to his work, and in the account of his petty quarrel with a rival printer over the production of a Bible, Jennett gives us a warm account of the human qualities of Baskerville which history has not hidden under his accomplishments. Though it tells us nothing of Baskerville's life, the story of the vagrant wanderings of the poor man's body after his death is grotesque comedy at its best and one of the most absorbing passages in the book.

The chapters on the discovery of lithography and the invention of composing machines give a good account of the history of these events but fall short of uncovering palpable personalities for the inventors—Senefelder, Mergenthaler, and Lanston. Koenig, however, materializes as a tolerant and gentle figure who was yet sufficiently single-minded to pursue the successful development of a power-driven press all the way from St. Petersburg to an abandoned Premonstratensian monastery near Würzburg. The account of the development of presses from the wooden hand press to the printing machines of today is given with a fine feeling for the drama which surely must have been present in the events.

In so far as we can know these men by their achievements, Jennett has given an excellent picture of them all. If he has not been entirely successful in bringing life to each of his subjects, it is due more to the little there is to go on and to the

peculiar way history has of obscuring its greatest men behind their gifts, than to Jennett's lack of sympathy with or understanding of his subjects.

S. B. Gribble

University of Kentucky

Kaufman, Paul. *Borrowings from the Bristol Library, 1773-1784; A Unique Record of Reading Vogues.* Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1960. 138 pp. $5.00.

In *Borrowings from the Bristol Library, 1773-1784,* Kaufman presents an analysis of the earliest and perhaps the only record of borrowings from an eighteenth-century English city library. With care and imagination he has tabulated, and verified insofar as possible, the precise title of each of 900 books represented in 13,947 withdrawals from the Bristol Library Society during the ten-year period. The data are arranged by the nine major subject classes which were used by the Library itself, and within each class, by author and title. Since the data are derived from five lending registers, the author has listed the number of borrowings for each title in five columns, with a sixth providing a cumulative total for the whole period. Out of this set of tables, comprising 104 of the book's 138 pages, he has provided a provocative insight into the reading tastes of the middle-class public of the time.

What looks at first glance to be a dull set of columns of figures soon becomes a fascinating record of reading and readers. Kaufman's suggestive analyses of the tabulations—his footnotes are as entertaining as his text—succeed admirably in doing what a pilot study should do: stimulate the reader to contemplate similar studies and more intensive analysis of the data. Out of the apparently static register of borrowed titles, we begin to gain some important insights into the tastes and temper of the time.

We are able to identify, for example, the ten most popular titles; to see how little used in its day was some of the literature that has lasted; to seek in vain for some of the writers who today we identify as central to the period. An incidental revelation of these figures is the evidence that general reading patterns have changed but little in the intervening years. We see the heavy use of certain popular titles immediately after their addition to the collection, and the rapid decline of attention after a few years. We see a very few titles (Gibbon's *Decline and Fall,* gratifyingly, is one) that gain attention more slowly, but actually grow in readership with the passage of time as their reputations become established. We see the tendency, then as now, for readers to read *about* some of the well-known "classics" rather than to read the classics themselves. In other words, these long-

forgotten persons become living readers to us again, readers like ourselves. (It is the reviewer, and not Kaufman, who so incautiously equates borrowing with reading; Kaufman's conclusions are, rightly, much more reserved. Nevertheless, it is probably not too great a distortion of reality to consider these records to be a limited reflection, accurate within its limits, of general reading tastes.)

Kaufman suggests additional tabulations that are needed, and generously indicates his willingness to make available to interested scholars the microfilms of the next six registers. It is to be hoped that this offer will be accepted. Kaufman has irrefutably established the value of this kind of analysis, and more studies like it—and as good—would be extremely welcome.

Lester Asheim

University of Chicago

Lemke, Antje, trans. *Aldus Manutius and His Thesaurus Cornucopiæ of 1496.* . . . Intro. by Donald P. Bean. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1958. 14 pp., 14 facsim. pp.

"I have begot my own misfortune. I have . . . overburdened myself with great labors. My only consolation is the assurance that my labors are helpful to all, and that the fame and the use of my books increase from day to day. . . . Devote yourself, I beseech you, devote yourself to good literature, of which I will make available the greatest and best, with the help of Jesus Christ."

Printer, scholar, book collector, librarian—all are in debt to the author of these noble and ambitious words, Aldus Manutius, then forty, writing of his great project, already under way for seven years, of printing the Greek and Latin classics "in spite of all difficulties and as expeditiously as possible." He hoped to combine practical needs with artistic ideals; to supply attractive, useful, and instructive books at fair prices.

The occasion of his writing was the publication of what Aldus called variously *Cornucopiae, The Garden of Adonis*, and *Thesaurus* because "it contains practically everything that anyone could desire in order to achieve perfect knowledge of Greek literature." In his graceful preface Aldus "gives his most devoted greetings to all students"; tells of his *Thesaurus* and his publishing plans in general; and announces that he will shortly have in print all of Aristotle and the commentaries on his works.

This edition of Antje Lemke's English version of the preface is a slim, rather attractive folio printed by deep-etch lithography. The translation is accompanied by selected facsimile pages of the Greek and Latin text from the copy of the *Thesaurus* in the Brewster House Typographical Collection, and it is preceded

by an introduction by Donald P. Bean, Director of the Syracuse University Press. In addition to this "Deluxe edition," there is a "Trade edition" reduced photographically to about half the size of the folio.

A few aspects of this book seem rather confusing. For instance, the "Original Latin Contents Page" [p. 8] has opposite it the "Translation of Contents." But the "translation" refers apparently, not to the Latin contents page but to the Greek contents page [p. 15] which, like the English version, has no reference to Aelius Dionysius (entry 13 of the Latin version). The Latin contents page is reproduced twice (page [8] and again page [16]) as is also the first page of the Latin text (page [10] and again page [17]). It is unfortunate that in a book with the number of reproductions necessarily limited there should have been this duplication.

The covers simulate the binding of the Syracuse University copy, but the sewing unfortunately destroys this illusion. The book is in one large gathering sewed inside the middle fold with many short machine stitches which remind one only of a commercially rebound book in a public library. The "Trade Edition" is so greatly reduced in size that it is not attractive and the type cannot be read comfortably.

Nonetheless it is good to have these interesting remarks by a famous printer available in a pleasant translation.

Paul S. Dunkin

Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers University

Lohf, Kenneth A., and Sheehy, Eugene P. *Frank Norris: A Bibliography.* Los Gatos, Cal.: The Talisman Press, 1959. xvi, 107 pp. $5.75.

More than twenty-five years have passed since the first bibliography of Frank Norris was attempted by Joseph Gaer as part of the state of California's WPA-type of project during the depression. That mimeographed pamphlet, issued in a very limited edition, was neither complete nor accurate. There has long been a need for a full, careful bibliography of Norris's contributions to American literature and a checklist of writings about him. *Frank Norris: A Bibliography* by two librarians is a professional work of the sort that has been required, and it comes at a propitious time. During the past decade interest in Norris's work has increased substantially, as represented, for example, by a new edition of *McTeague,* three new editions of *The Octopus,* two new editions of *The Pit,* two new editions of *Vandover and the Brute,* a collection of Norris's letters, and more extended and serious study of his writings in specialized dissertations, scholarly articles and books, and in literary histories.

Frank Norris wrote a great deal during his short life of thirty-two years, yet he published only six books during his lifetime. These were followed by nine posthumously issued works: two novels, a gathering of critical essays, four collections of stories, and two pamphlet publications—a slight parable and a slim news account. The later collections were assembled from the 155 articles and sketches that Lohf and Sheehy list as originally printed in newspapers and magazines, but a great deal of Norris's journalism and slighter fiction even now remains ungathered.

Collected or uncollected, Norris's publications are numerous enough to make a forty-page bibliography of his own works and a twenty-five-page list of writings about them. A preface, lists of dramatizations and film adaptations, facsimiles of Norris's title pages and manuscript, an index, and subtitle pages to divide the bibliography into sections swell the work by Lohf and Sheehy into a nice little volume. In the first section of the bibliography Norris's collected sets and separately published works are entered by date of publication with reprints in chronological order, and with translations listed alphabetically by language. The second section of the bibliography lists contributions to periodicals, alphabetically arranged within groupings by genres. The final section is divided into two parts: a list of works about Norris and a list of book reviews.

The work is careful and, on the whole, very thorough. However, there are minor errors and omissions. On the page of errata (itself called "erratum") several typographical errors pass unnoticed, e.g., the misspelling on page 29 of the name of the publisher, Rinehart; also on page 29, the incorrect date (1911 instead of 1910) of a Danish edition of *McTeague*; the incorrect punctuation, spelling, and type form in the title of a Danish translation of *The Pit* (p. 35); and the incorrect pagination of a Danish edition of *Vandover and the Brute* cited on page 40. Omitted are a Polish translation of *The Pit,* issued at Warsaw in 1923, and the reprinting of "Italy in California" (item 191) as a separate leaflet in the series, *The Vine in Early California,* issued by The Book Club of California in 1955. Also neglected is another leaflet issued by the same organization of bibliophiles, *The Letters of Western Authors . . . Number 3,* a letter from Norris reproduced in facsimile, with a page of comment by Franklin Walker.

An attempt to list all writings of consequence about Norris is a useful but difficult undertaking, and Lohf and Sheehy have failed to find some writings that should be included. Their reference to the search for manuscripts for The Bancroft Library should be amplified by citation of two long newspaper articles by Joseph Henry Jackson in the "This World" section of the *San Francisco Chronicle,* respectively on page 26 of the 21 Sept. 1952 issue and page 15 of the 19 Oct. 1952 issue, and an anonymous article, "Frank Norris," in the *California Monthly* for March 1953. Incidentally, it should be observed that the portion of

the *McTeague* manuscript inserted in volume one of each set of the Argonaut edition is sometimes only a half, not a full page. Finally, important but unnoticed comment on Norris may be found in Marcus Cunliffe's *The Literature of the United States*; Frederick J. Hoffman's *The Modern Novel in America*; Eric Larrabee's *American Panorama*, which describes the 350 books distributed by the Carnegie Corporation to libraries in Commonwealth countries as a portrait of America in the written word; Ray B. West's *The Short Story in America, 1900-1950*; and the review in *American Literature* (November 1956) of the most recent volume of Norris's writings, his *Letters*.

James D. Hart

University of California, Berkeley

Rodenberg, Julius. *Grösse und Grenzen der Typographie; Betrachtungen über typographische Grundfragen, wie sie sich in der Buchkunst der letzten siebenzig Jahre widerspiegeln.* Stuttgart: Poeschel, 1959. 204 pp., 178 illus. DM 19.80.

Julius Rodenberg, formerly curator of the special collections of the Deutsche Bücherei at Leipzig, reviews in this volume the "greatness and the limitations of typography, as illustrated in the last seventy years of bookmaking."

In three introductory chapters the basic principles of typography and the developments since William Morris are outlined. The main section opens with a chapter on handwriting as the basis for printed type and a brief history of printing. This is followed by a description of the components of book production: paper, format, design, and type, all of which have to be in harmony with each other and with the content of the book. Rodenberg stresses that readability should never be sacrificed to the artistic appearance of a page, a rule which William Morris often did not observe. In a beautiful title page Rodenberg sees the "crowning glory" of every designer.

The next section deals with different types of books: the illustrated volume, poetry, drama, scholarly publications, juveniles, and religious works. In his observations on the relationship between illustrator and author Rodenberg asks whether the great works of literature, which depend so much upon our imagination for images, should be illustrated at all, or whether the illustrator should select texts which lend themselves more readily to graphic description. Many of us will be sceptical about his suggestion that beautiful volumes of poetry might be created if each poem had its own type and design. Rodenberg points out that scholarly books, neglected for centuries by the bookmaking craft, have lately received much attention, with excellent results. Children's books are considered one of "the most beautiful and challenging of the designer's tasks." In addition to craftsmanship and literary knowledge, the making of good books for children

calls for great sensitivity and "even the heart of a child." While the achievements in scholarly works prove that the skills and taste of the modern typographer are at a peak, children's books, especially school textbooks, have not yet reached the same height. More could be done if the bookmaker would take greater care and "work with love." The greatest challenge for all printers lies in the Bible. Among the best examples of a modern approach, the Bibles of the Doves Press and the Nonesuch Press are cited. The book closes with a description of the book cover as "the calling card of author and publisher," and reference to its importance in the promotion of the book.

While the illustrations are well selected and truly illuminate the text, some reproductions are so small that indication of their original size would have been helpful. The index is of little assistance because of several mistakes and the omission of important terms and names which appear in the text. These shortcomings are, however, insignificant in view of the wealth of information in the book and the author's erudition. If we are not already aware of it, Rodenberg certainly convinces us that "typography is an integral part of our cultural life."

Antje B. Lemke

Syracuse University

Todd, William B., ed. *Thomas J. Wise Centenary Studies.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1959. 126 pp. $3.00.

Before 1934 visitors to England would look at the lilies sparkling white in the pond, admire the well-kept lawn which sloped down to its banks, sit in the shade of the overhanging oaks, and say to themselves that, surely, this is one of the most beautiful ponds in the world.

Then two young gentlemen named Carter and Pollard went fishing in the pond. Their hooks became snagged and they pulled and pulled and up came a litter of shocking and disgusting debris which had been hidden beneath the shimmering waters. Soon the banks became overgrown with esparto grass; inky sorts with kernless f's and j's and tilted question marks were heaped on the clayey margin; the authoritarian oaks were chopped down and their leafless crowns made a waste of the waters; and the torn pages of books and letters, scattered and befouled, clung to the festering lilies.

Thus "transited" the glory of Thomas J. Wise. The story of his decline and fall has been told well and often. But there is a morbid fascination in fishing in the stagnant pond, for there are still old shoes and tin cans to be brought up from the bottom. The *Centenary Studies* present some of these—what might politely be termed "archaeological finds"—described in painstaking detail.

John Carter, wittily as usual and appropriately as an All Fools' Day speech, gives a resumé of the metamorphosis of Wise from a great collector-bibliographer to an unscrupulous forger and confidence man. William B. Todd dissects two letters from Wise to one of his customers, J. E. Cornish, to demonstrate a typical "ploy in the art of fraudmanship." Graham Pollard dissects a letter from Wise to Sir Edmund Gosse to indicate that the latter was a dupe rather than a duper, and then goes on to prove that Swinburne's *The Devil's Due* should be added to the growing list of proven forgeries. Todd contributes another chapter in the history of bibliographical dishonesty by tracing chronologically Wise's conflicting accounts of the origin of Elizabeth Barrett Browning's *Sonnets*, culminating with the most elaborate lie of them all as printed in the Introduction to *The Browning Library*. Pollard returns to the fray with an essay suggesting the potentialities of further typographical analysis. (Quick, Watson, the microscope!) And finally, Todd lists and labels for what they are 401 books written, edited, published, forged and/or pirated by Wise. These gentlemen perform their post-mortems with the clinical precision of brain surgeons.

Perhaps the next generation will list books about books written, edited, published, forged and/or pirated by Wise. The evidence may not yet be all in. A dead cat or two may be lying on the bottom of the pond. We do now however know that Wise was venally dishonest, that Buxton Forman was only less so, that Wrenn was had, that the British Museum was raped, and that l'affaire Wise will prove fascinating, in a kind of masochistic way, to bookmen for years to come.

This *pestschrift* to the memory of Thomas J. Wise is handsomely printed by the University of Texas Press. The bull's skull on the title is an appropriate fleuron.

Edwin Wolf 2nd

The Library Company of Philadelphia

Tougas, Gérard. *A Check List of Printed Materials Relating to French Canadian Literature.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Library, 1958. 93 pp. $2.50.

The result of years of collecting in the field of French-Canadian literature, this check list of materials in the University of British Columbia Library includes approximately 700 authors and over 1,500 titles and represents a considerable proportion of the literature produced in French Canada since 1763.

The word *literature* is interpreted broadly enough to include not only the novel, poetry, drama, short stories, chronicles, literary criticism, and biographies

of authors, but also parliamentary oratory, travelers' chronicles, and folklore. Translations and various editions have also been listed. Excluded are pulpit oratory, philosophy, history, newspapers and periodicals, and anonymous works pertaining to the literature of Canada. In the field of history one exception is made to include François-Xavier Garnier, whose *Histoire du Canada* has inspired successive generations of French-Canadian writers from its publication in 1839 down to the present time.

Writings before the Treaty of Paris in 1763 are excluded, since they were all published in France by authors who, for the most part, died in France, but creative works distinctly Canadian in character, by authors like Louis Hémon and Maurice Constantin-Weyer, who spent part of their lives in Canada, are included.

Biographical references, mostly in the form of bio-bibliographies on microfilm, are given for approximately 225 of the authors. These references are in indented italics which are quickly identifiable and make simple the task of anyone in search of biographical material only.

Though no complete bibliography of French-Canadian literature exists, this check list of University of British Columbia holdings, along with Antonio Drolet's *Bibliographie du roman canadian-français, 1900-1950* and Gérard Martin's *Bibliographie sommaire du Canada français 1854-1954*, provides another long step toward a comprehensive bibliography of French-Canadian literary production.

Lucien W. White

University of Illinois

Wolf, Edwin, 2nd. *A Check-list of the Books in the Library Company of Philadelphia, in and supplementary to Wing's Short-title Catalogue, 1641-1700.* Philadelphia: The Library Company of Philadelphia, 1959. viii, 106 pp.

The "something under 4,000 titles" in the collection of the Library Company are listed by Wing number in the Wing form of entry. From copies at Philadelphia it was possible to emend some Wing entries. Others provide new entries entirely. Emendations and additions are distinctively marked. Donald Wing, compiler of the parent catalogue, checked the emendations and additions before this check-list was published.

A strong point of this work is the record of provenance provided for so many of the books. Although the compiler made no attempt to provide this record for routine purchases, he has noted it for many prominent Pennsylvanians of the eighteenth century. In addition, whenever a book was included in one of the

eighteenth-century catalogues or supplements of the library, the date of its earliest appearance is cited. A provenance index lists alphabetically the names of previous owners cited in the check-list. This index is an inadequate guide to some of the most important associations, however, because such names as Benjamin Franklin and James Logan, instead of being followed by citations to Wing numbers, have only the notation: "*see* entries *seriatim*."

The compiler has contributed an informative introduction about the growth of the collection in the eighteenth century. He points out that this list of books differs from many rare book collections because it was accumulated as a working collection for contemporaries and still retains its eighteenth-century integrity. For this reason, the check-list and the records of provenance become an important aid to the study of American intellectual history. The only key to the provenance markings exists in references scattered throughout the introduction. A systematic key would have increased the ease of use. Another lapse in the introduction must be mentioned: a confusion of antecedents renders the account of Benjamin Franklin's contributions to the collection unintelligible.

Printed in England, this book features good typography, good press work, and good paper. Unfortunately, it also features the typical English bibliographical binding with the curling boards.

Howard W. Winger

University of Chicago

BRIEFER MENTION

A Brief Account of the Clifton Waller Barrett Library (Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1960) by Herbert Cahoon is a concise survey in thirty-five pages of one of the greatest libraries formed by an American in the twentieth century. The riches of the Barrett Library beggar description, and Mr. Cahoon had to be content with noting the high spots of the collection and providing a broad description of the larger groups. It is clear from this account that students of almost any aspect of American literature will fail to visit Charlottesville at their own peril.

While the *Papers* of the Bibliographical Society of America do not ordinarily review books in the field of library economy, it would be an error of omission to exclude the third volume of Svend Dahl's *Nordisk Håndbog i Bibliotekskundskab* (Copenhagen: Alfred G. Hassing, 1960; 520 pp.) on this technicality. It contains sections on book production, publishing, and the management of special collections that are among the best in any language. Hans Sallander's essay on

collections of incunabula, Solveig Tunold's notes on manuscript collections, and the late Erik Gren's ideas on orientalia in libraries will be of major interest to collectors, dealers, and librarians.

Books by Balzac: a Checklist of Books by Honoré de Balzac, compiled from the Papers of William Hobart Royce, presently in the Syracuse University Collection (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1960; 90 pp.) by Albert J. George has been prepared for inclusion in the new edition of Royce's *Balzac Bibliography* (1929) which will appear soon in Syracuse. Each of Balzac's works is listed alphabetically by title, with short notes. The complexities of Balzacian publication are recognized clearly by Mr. George, and therefore he has left a wide outside margin for addenda. It has been announced that the new edition of the *Balzac Bibliography* will contain some 6,000 entries, or fifty per cent more than the first edition.

Hans Lülfing's *Leipziger Frühdrucker* (Leipzig: VEB Otto-Harrassowitz, 1959; 14 unnumbered leaves) is a series of essays on early Leipzig printers: Marcus Brandis, Moritz Brandis, Arnold Neumarkt von Köln, Gregor Boettiger, Martin Landsberg, Jakob Thanner, Wolfgang Stoeckel, Konrad Kachelofen, and Melchior Lotter the Elder. The essays vary in length, depending upon what is actually known about each printer: Lülfing has summarized the existing literature and makes no effort to provide answers for unsolved problems or to dissect current issues critically.

The centennial of Adam Mickiewicz' death in 1955 was the occasion of a number of critical and bibliographical publications in all major languages. One of the most important was prepared by the Institut Russkoĭ Literatury of the Akademiiâ Nauk, *Adam Mitskevich v russkoĭ literatury 1825-1955; bibliograficheskie materialy* (Moscow and Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1957; 599 pp.). The bulk of the 2,683 entries cover Russian translations of Mickiewicz and critical literature on his work, but shorter sections list Russian musical scores for texts by Mickiewicz and the Russian iconography of the poet. There are indexes of Polish and Russian titles and of translators and critics, several bibliographical essays on Mickiewicz, and a section of plates showing portraits, and pages of Mickiewicz' works in Russian.

The catalogue of the calligraphy and illumination exhibition held at the Peabody Institute Library, Baltimore (2 Nov.-Dec. 1959) is an unpretentious mimeographed brochure whose appearance belies the splendor and interest of the materials it describes. The emphasis of the show was on modern calligraphy, and numerous loans were made by members of the Society of Scribes and Illu-

minators and the Society for Italic Handwriting. At the end of the catalogue is a list of manuals and textbooks, and a reading list selected from books in the Peabody.

Serafino Prete's catalog of *I codici della Biblioteca comunale di Fermo* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1960; "Biblioteca di bibliografia italiana," 35; 194 pp.) describes in detail the small but distinguished collection of 122 manuscripts in Fermo. The manuscripts date from the eleventh through the fifteenth centuries and include important religious and legal works and classical texts. Each entry has a collation and a description of contents and a list of references to modern studies of the manuscript. There is a list of incipits and a general index.

The eleventh volume of *Der Romanführer*, the extensive collection of summaries of fiction in all literatures, appeared in 1960 under the title of *Der Inhalt der nordamerikanischen Romane und Novellen der Gegenwart* (Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1960; 383 pp.). It records over 400 titles by 144 authors. For each title there is a signed resumé by one of the thirty-six contributors. While the selections are undoubtedly influenced by the availability of German translations, the list is well balanced and omits no significant personality in American fiction of the twentieth century.

I. I. Startsev's *Khudozhestvennaia literatura narodov SSSR v perevodakh na russkikh iazyk; bibliografiia, 1934-1954* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennoĭ Literatury, 1957; 751 pp.) is an invaluable guide to the literatures of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. in Russian. The literature and recorded folklore of sixty-two languages are represented in this volume; and in the case of many of them, the Russian translations are the only ones in any Indo-European language. The twenty years covered by this bibliography were among the most productive in the literary history of many of the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union. There is a general index of names and an index of serial titles.

Wolfgang Vulpius' *Schiller Bibliographie 1893-1958* (Weimar: Arion Verlag, 1959; 569 pp.) is a classified bibliography of nearly 7,500 items by and about Schiller. Vulpius has exhausted every source with meticulous care, even though he had to be selective for some types of publications (e.g., for the enormous mass of memorial addresses in the Schiller jubilee years of 1905 and 1955), but the bibliography is comprehensive for the significant literature. There is an author index.

The second fascicle of the *Bibliographie de la Réforme, 1450-1648; ouvrages parus de 1940 à 1955* (Leiden: E. G. Brill, for the Commission Internationale d'histoire écclesiastique comparée, 1960, 156 pp.) covers the literature of

Belgium, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Ireland, and the United States in the field of Reformation history from 1940 to 1955. By far the most extensive in this section is the American literature, occupying well over half of this fascicle, with 1,990 entries. The first fascicle of this bibliography appeared in 1958 and dealt with publications in the Germanies and the Netherlands; the third will deal with publications in Italy, Spain, and Portugal. Other countries will be covered gradually. Each national list is arranged alphabetically by author and has a subject and topographical index. It is hoped that this bibliography will appear in the future at the end of every decade.

Die Bibliographie in den europäischen Ländern der Volksdemokratie: Entwicklung und gegenwärtiger Stand (Leipzig: VEB Verlag für Buch- und Bibliothekswesen, 1960; "Bibliothekswissenschaftliche Arbeiten aus der Sowjetunion und den Ländern der Volksdemokratie in deutscher Übersetzung," Series B, III; 165 pp.), by Todor Borov, Maria Dembowska, Mircea Tomescu, Jaroslav Drtina, Josef Kuzmík, and Pál Bélley, is a survey of the history and present status of general and subject bibliography in Albania, Bulgaria, Poland, Roumania, Bohemia-Moravia, Slovakia, and Hungary. Each essay, by an authority in the country concerned, provides an historical introduction covering the period through the end of World War II, a record of achievements in the last fifteen years, and a list of the most important bibliographical publications in these countries. There is an appendix on the bibliographical publications in East Germany on the literature of the communist-bloc countries, and an author and subject index. This work is an invaluable guide to bibliographical traditions that are little known in English-speaking countries. Ultimately this work will be superseded by the studies of K. Maichel of Columbia (excepting the material on Albania and Hungary); but in the meanwhile it will be an indispensable reference for Slavicists and Balkanists.

Three previously published essays by Carl Björkbom are brought together in a tastefully printed little volume entitled *Det gamla boktryckeriet* (Stockholm: Sällskapet Bokvännerna, 1960; "Bokvännens minatyrserie," no. 10; 78 pp.). The first is an illustrated Swedish translation of the seventh and last of Christoph Plantin's *Dialogues françois pour les jeunes enfans* (1567), describing printing. Björkbom has selected a number of famous sixteenth-century illustrations of presses to accompany his translation. The second is the famous description of David Séchard's printing house in Angoulême in Balzac's *Illusions perdues* (1839-43). The last essay is a commentary on Vannuccio Biringuccio's *Pirotechnia* (Venice, 1540) and his instructions for casting type.

Jacob Korg's George Gissing bibliography in the first number of *English*

Fiction in Transition listed only items published after 1940. Joseph J. Wolff's "George Gissing: An Annotated Bibliography of Writings about Him: Supplement," *English Fiction in Transition* III (1960), 3-33, is devoted chiefly to items published before 1940, thus completing the bibliographical picture of Gissing. The same issue of *EFT* contains a supplement to the basic George Moore bibliography published in *EFT* in 1959.

Felix Reichmann's *Sugar, Gold, and Coffee; Essays on the History of Brazil based on Francis Hull's Books* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Library, 1959; 160 pp.) is a pleasing collection of eight informal historico-bibliographical essays on the sweep of Brazilian history. The Hull Library of Braziliana was purchased for Cornell after the owner's death in 1951 by Herbert F. Johnson, Cornell alumnus and trustee. Dr. Reichmann, who inspected the collection *in situ* at Colonel Hull's Fortaleza home as early as 1949, disclaims any intention of adding to the literature of Latin American history. His purpose was simply to establish a "memorial to an important collection." Whatever his original intention, Dr. Reichmann has issued an attractive and informative invitation to Ithaca for students of things Brazilian.

The *Index to Little Magazines, 1958-1959* (Denver: Alan Swallow, 1960; 199 pp.), compiled by Eugene P. Sheehy and Kenneth A. Lohf, begins its second decade with this volume. It is a two-year cumulation, indexing fifty-one titles for 1958 and 1959. A more descriptive title would be "Significant American Literary and Critical Periodicals Not Included in the Wilson Indexes," since it includes titles ranging from *The Texas Quarterly* and *The New Mexico Quarterly* to *Hearse* and *The Houyhnhnm's Scrapbook*. The index is by author and subject. Reviews are under the author of the title reviewed.

Lewis M. Stark and Maud D. Cole are compilers of a *Checklist of Additions to Evans' American Bibliography in the Rare Book Division of the New York Public Library* (New York: New York Public Library, 1960; 110 pp.). They record 1,289 items hitherto scattered in the Division's annotated set of Charles Evans' *American Bibliography*. The first of these entries was made by Wilberforce Eames. Stark and Cole include not only originals but also photostats and other facsimiles; in the latter case they show the location of the original, whenever it is known. The list does not include any of the early music to be covered by Richard J. Wolfe's extension and revision of Sonneck and Upton's *Bibliography of Early Secular American Music*. The entries in Stark and Cole are in short-title form, similar to Shipton's thirteenth volume of Evans, and are, of course, arranged chronologically. There is an index of authors, corporate main entries, anonymous titles, and titles entered under a bracketed author entry.

The *Union List of Foreign Journals of Social Sciences in the Research Libraries of Finland* (Helsingfors: Eduskunnan Kirjasto, 1960; "Library of Parliament Publications," 3; 249 pp.) records 1,404 periodicals in the broad field of social studies that are available in forty Finnish libraries. Only printed journals which were published in the twentieth century have been included. The main list is alphabetical, and there is a classified list, by short titles, in fourteen sections. It includes many titles, especially from eastern and northern Europe, that are either absent from American and British union lists of serials or are represented only by fragmentary files in one or two libraries.

Coolie Verner's *A Carto-Bibliographical Study of the English Pilot, the Fourth Book, with Special Reference to the Charts of Virginia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1960; 89 pp.) is a detailed analysis of the "first great atlas of wholly English origin to deal exclusively with American waters." Verner provides a full imprint inventory of *The Pilot,* of John Thornton's chart of Virginia and Maryland, of the Atlantic coast charts, and of Mark Tiddeman's charts of Virginia and New York. The study provides many insights into the practices of seventeenth-century English map makers, and Verner untangles many of the complex interlocking relationships of early English map publishers. The text has been reproduced by offset, and the five illustrations (facsimiles of maps) are quite sharp.

EDITORIAL NOTE: An attempt has been made to include in this issue all the book reviews which are in hand, so that future review sections can be devoted to more current material.—R.F.M.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

Lester Asheim is Dean of the Graduate Library School of The University of Chicago.

Roger L. Brooks is a member of the Department of English of Texas Technological College.

Thomas P. Buckman is Acquisitions Librarian in The University of Kansas Library.

James B. Childs is Chief Document Officer in The Library of Congress.

Paul S. Dunkin is Professor of Librarianship at Rutgers University.

George F. Frick is a member of the History Department of The University of Delaware.

Harvey Fried is a member of the Department of English at Queens College, Flushing.

S. B. Gribble is Assistant to the Director of The University of Kentucky Library.

Tom Burns Haber is Professor of English at The Ohio State University.

James D. Hart is Vice-chancellor of The University of California, Berkeley, and Professor of English.

Paul Kaufman is Consultant in Bibliography in The University of Washington Library.

Frederick G. Kilgour is Librarian of The School of Medicine, Yale University.

Antje B. Lemke is Lecturer in the Library School of Syracuse University.

Felix Reichmann is Assistant Director of the Cornell University Library.

Lyman W. Riley is Custodian of Continental European Materials in the Rare Book Collection of the University of Pennsylvania.

Hans Sallander is Head of the Catalogue Department and Assistant Librarian of The University of Uppsala.

Paul Standard is a typographer and calligrapher in New York City.

David M. Vieth is Associate Professor of English at The University of Kansas.

Eugene P. Watson is Librarian of The Northwestern State College of Louisiana, Natchitoches.

Herbert F. West is Professor of Comparative Literature at Dartmouth College.

Lucien W. White is Associate Director (in charge of public service) in The University of Illinois Library.

William White is Professor of Journalism at The Wayne State University.

Howard Winger is Associate Professor in the Graduate Library School of The University of Chicago.

Edwin Wolf 2nd is Librarian of The Library Company of Philadelphia and Secretary of the *BSA*.